

The Federalist Party in Massachusetts to the Year 1800

BY

ANSON ELY MORSE, PH. D.

Associate Professor of History in Marietta
College and sometime Fellow in Princeton
University ❁ ❁ ❁ ❁ ❁ ❁

PRINCETON:

The University Library

1909

Press of
HAZLETT, HARRISON & CO.
Trenton, N. J.
1909

CONTENTS.

Preface	3
Chapter I. The Social Background.....	5
Chapter II. Political Parties and Conditions in Massachusetts, 1775-1780	11
Chapter III. The Parties of Hancock and Bow- doin. Shays' Rebellion	26
Chapter IV. The Adoption of the Federal Con- stitution in Massachusetts.....	40
Chapter V. The Triumph of Hancock, 1788 to 1793	54
Chapter VI. The French Revolution as viewed by the People in Massachusetts.....	67
Chapter VII. The French Revolution as viewed by the Clergy in Massachusetts...	88
Chapter VIII. The Political Power of the Clergy	116
Chapter IX. The Growth of the Federalist Party in Massachusetts, 1793 to 1796.....	140
Chapter X. The Clergy and the Democrats...	163
Chapter XI. The Triumph of the Federalist Party, 1796 to 1800.....	174
Chapter XII. Bibliography.....	189

Appendix A. Commotions before Shay's Rebellion	206
Appendix B. Shays' Rebellion.....	207
Appendix C. The Election of 1787.....	209
Appendix D. The Aftermath of Shay's Rebellion	211
Appendix E. Hancock's Bargain with the Federalists	212
Appendix F. The Treatment of Lincoln by Hancock	214
Appendix G. Civic Feasts and Other Extrava- gances	215
Appendix H. Sermons Descanting on the Lack of Religion	216
Appendix I. The Attacks upon Paine and the Age of Reason.....	217
Appendix J. Influences of the Clergy in New England	219
Appendix K. Democratic Attacks upon the Clergy	220
Appendix L. Alarm over Religion in New England	221
Appendix M. Republican Attachment to France	223
Appendix N. "Dangers" to Congregational- ism	224
Appendix O. "Weapons" Against Ecclesiasti- cal Authority	225
Index	226

PREFACE.

This Thesis was prepared to complete the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Princeton University.

The subject was suggested by the work done in the American History Seminars of Professor F. J. Turner of the University of Wisconsin during the years 1903-4 and 1904-5. While studying the Federalist party in Massachusetts for the years 1816 to 1824, the writer was struck by the fact that the strength of that party lay in a great measure in the western half of the state. In as much as a previous study of Shays' Rebellion, for a Master of Arts' Thesis, had shown that section to be the radical democratic portion of the state,¹ the questions arose as to when this change had occurred and what was the powerful factor which brought about such an overturn. The answer, as it seems to the writer, is to be found in the following pages.

Among the many librarians from whom have been received courtesies and facilities for research are those of the Congressional Library, the Pennsylvania Historical Society, the Leno \acute{x} Library, the Connecticut Historical Society, the New England Historic and Genealogical Society, the Boston Public Library, the State Library of Massachusetts, the libraries of Princeton University, the University of Wisconsin and Amherst College, and especially the American Antiquarian Society of Worcester, Massachusetts.

(1) The writer follows the usage of the time in employing the terms democrat and republican interchangeably in the following pages. Abraham Bishop, the leading democratic politician of Connecticut of the Jeffersonian period, in his *Oration on the Extent and Power of Political Delusion* delivered in New Haven, September, 1800, (Philadelphia, 1800) asserts on page 7 (foot note) that he has made use of both words as their significance is exactly the same. The attempt of the federalists to use the epithet, democrat, as a term of reproach for the members of the Republican party was not very successful.

It is a very great pleasure also to express deep appreciation of the critical aid given by Professor E. S. Corwin and Dr. Ernest C. Richardson of Princeton University and Professor Anson D. Morse of Amherst, Mass., but above all my thanks are due to my wife for her unwearied assistance.

ANSON ELY MORSE.

CHAPTER I.

THE SOCIAL BACKGROUND.

The social development of New England, like its history, was due largely to three principal causes; the homogeneity of the people for nearly two centuries, the geographical isolation of the country in which they settled, and most important of all, the intensity of religious enthusiasm and the identity of religious convictions.

In any investigation of the various phases of the history and development of New England we find that the predominating feature is religion. It permeated New England life in all its relations, civil as well as personal. The significance and consequence of this feeling cannot be overestimated. It explains in large part the cause for settlement, the early theocratical form of government, the rooted policy of opposition to England, the zeal for education, the growth in isolation, the leadership of the American Revolution, and the inherent antagonism to the South.

As the social structure of any people depends largely on its ethnical composition, so the fact that for nearly two centuries the population of Massachusetts remained almost purely English, is of great significance. This remarkable homogeneity was due, at first, to the circumstances by reason of which the Pilgrims and Puritans emigrated from England and the purpose for which they exiled themselves to a new country. With the overthrow of the Royalist and the triumph of the Puritan party, the motive for leaving England was gone. The only source of

immigration thus failing, Massachusetts had to depend for development upon the natural increase of her own population.¹ Had there not been the violent opposition to immigration on religious grounds, which in itself was effectual—as witness the unfortunate intrusion of the Quakers—the harshness of the climate, the barrenness of the soil, and the fact that commerce, until the 18th century, offered nothing but ordinary gains, all these, would have effectually deterred the stranger from venturing into the midst of the Puritan zealots.² Furthermore, New England was large enough for her surplus population until the Revolution. Connecticut, to be sure, on account of her position, sent not a few of her sons to Long Island and their intrusion into Pennsylvania caused serious friction. But as a rule, Massachusetts and Connecticut sent their excess to people the New England wilderness. The orthodox settled Western Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, while the unorthodox unsettled Rhode Island.³ The full settlement of Vermont⁴ was not

(1) It was only after the Revolution that any considerable infiltration occurred. Thus the Hampshire Gazette, February 5, 1794, announces: "As, of late, Strangers have frequently arrived in this part of the country . . . The Massachusetts Society for the Information and Advice for Foreigners . . . (has been formed at Boston.)"

(2) He who braved the opposition was coldly received. "In 1663, [at Northampton] three acres of land were granted to Cornelius the Irishman; providing, however, that he should not 'be capable of acting in any town affairs.'" Dwight: *Travels*, I:350.

(3) "It was said, that, if any man happened to lose his religious opinion, he might be sure to find it again at some village in Rhode Island." Higginson: *The Puritan Minister*. *Atlantic Essays*, p. 219. The contempt of orthodox New England for "little Rhody" is well expressed by such terms as "The Sink of New England" and "Rogue Island." Rev. H. Channing to D. Daggett, Lyme, Conn., Sept. 28, 1787: "Rhode Island will reject the proposed constitution, for the D——l hath great wrath, knowing that his time is short. They are a wretched people & have no prospect of speedy relief, unless there be a union of the other states. In this case I should hope to see them governed." *Proc. Am. Antiq. Soc. N. S. IV* (1885-7) 370. See Remarks on the American Universal Geography. By J. F. [Boston, 1793], who attacks the author's aspersions on the irreligion and ignorance of Rhode Island, pp. 40-8. The attitude of Rhode Island during Shays' Rebellion was highly unsatisfactory to the Massachusetts authorities. See the answer of Gov. Collins to Gov. Bowdoin, *Am. Herald*, April 9, 1787. See an attack on Rhode Island in *ibid*, May 28, 1787.

(4) "The whole number of inhabitants [of Vermont] in 1771, must have been about seven thousand." Williams: *Vermont*, 2d ed. II:478. In 1781, the Vermont delegates to Congress said concerning the number of inhabitants—probably with an eye more to making an impression than telling the truth—"We estimate them at about thirty thousand," *Vt. Hist. Soc., Coll. II*: 165.

accomplished until after the Revolution and Maine received her largest access of population after 1800.⁵ New England, as a whole, had no interests in common with the rest of the colonies except the ties of blood and speech. The struggle for existence and salvation with which she was occupied seemed to concern herself alone.

Of scarcely less importance in her development was the geographical position of New England. Although its isolation is less marked now by reason of the railroads, it exists and is felt to this day.⁶ New England was a territory whose trade, of necessity, had to be carried on by sea rather than land. Access to the westward was rendered exceedingly difficult by the mountainous character of that part of Massachusetts and Connecticut which borders on the state of New York. Lines of trade ran to the West Indies, Canada, including Nova Scotia, and to Europe, rather than to the other colonies.

Thus New England was a geographic as well as an ethnic unit, in which these and other causes contributed to isolate her and to evolve manners, morals, habits, interests and speech, not only dissimilar from the rest of the continent, but almost sufficient for the forming of a distinct nation and country. This separateness of character, developing during the course of two centuries, finds its conscious enunciation in the many utterances of leading men,⁷ and especially in its rivalry with the South. Indeed the

(5) This is shown by the rapid increase in the incorporation of the towns after 1800. Cf. Williamson: *Hist. of Maine*, *passim*.

(6) It has been pointed out by Professor Barrett Wendell, that the demand, especially by Massachusetts, for reciprocity with Canada and Nova Scotia is clearly due to this isolated geographical position of New England. This fact is recognized by the traveller, Pearson, who says: "Boston is not a thriving, i. e. an increasing town; it wants a fertile back country, and it is too far removed from the Western States to be engaged in the supply of that new and vast emporium, except, indeed, with inhabitants, a commodity which, I am informed, they send in numbers greater than from any other quarter." *Travels*, p. 108.

(7) Cf. Adams: Documents relating to New England Federalism, *passim*. Also Austin: *Life of Gerry*, I:174, 178, esp. 291.

idea of the "New England nation" plays a part, by no means unimportant in the various disunion projects until the close of the War of 1812.⁸

From 1775 to 1800, in Massachusetts, the problem of the readjustment of the social structure underlies the political questions and divisions of this momentous period. The fundamental interpretation of party activities for these twenty-five years is therefore to be found in the attempt to replace the loss of the Tory party by those conservative elements which, at first, gathered about Bowdoin and the Essex Junto and later became the Federalist party. The growth and triumph of this party is the more remarkable, in as much as it was contemporaneous with, but directly antagonistic to, the tide of democracy then sweeping the country. Moreover this Federalism—while the party existed—became permanently entrenched in Western Massachusetts, that portion of the state above all possessed by the extremest forms of democracy less than a decade before.

What then wrought this change, so abiding, that the Federalist party in Massachusetts was enabled to sway the state for a generation, long after the last

(8) The dislike of Virginia, as representing the South, is constantly cropping out. *Hampshire Gazette*, August 12, 1795. *Independent Chronicle*, October 26, December 7, 1795; January 12, 1797. While the feeling has existed since colonial times, it grew very rapidly after the Revolution, especially from 1800 until after the War of 1812. See address by "Falkland" [Fisher Ames] on a "Separation of the States. And its Consequences to New England." From the Columbian Centinel, quoted in the *Hampshire Gazette*, Sept. 28, 1808. *Ibid*, May 5, 1802: "If New England is to be 'La Vendee of America,' we felicitate ourselves on the fortress, which your state has erected [i. e., the election of Gov. Strong]...the spirit of domination in Virginia...has always existed...I trust the day is not distant when this truth will produce its proper effects, in promoting the union of New England." *Ibid*, Jan. 27, 1802: "His [Gov. Monroe] account of the Virginia Militia shows...it is not good for much...the Militia of New England is...well organized, armed and disciplined and...[is ready] to...maintain] those rights and liberties they have so often fought and bled for." See also *Federal Spy*, Feb. 23, 1802. Also in the *Hampshire Gazette*, Oct. 5, 1802, from the Centinel. After a discussion of New York state, whose interests were considered to be identical with New England and "a great majority of [whose] people... are either natives, or immediately descended from New-England....", there is a striking comparison between New England and New York—and the South in population, resources and wealth. The article ends with a most significant parallel drawn between the population of New York and New England at that date, and the white population of the thirteen colonies in 1775, which is shown to be at least equal. See also F. Ames to C. Gore, Oct. 3, 1803. *Works*, pt. 1, pp. 324-5; same to T. Pickering, Dedham, Dec. 22, 1806. *Works*: pt. 1, p. 380.

federalist organization in other states had disappeared?⁹ Simply that Massachusetts was still homogeneous, still English and more, still Puritan, especially in the western half; and consequently, under the leadership of the Congregational divines, was to be driven by the atheism born largely of the French Revolution into federalism.

This Thesis, in short, is a study of the genesis and development of the Federalist party in Massachusetts, from 1775 to 1800, the growth being largely due to the social and religious conditions in that state.

The result of the so-called Party Revolution of 1800 which ended the national importance and leadership of the federalists was not destructive of the power of that party in Massachusetts. Nevertheless it had the same narrowing blighting effect on the state as it did on the national party. As a matter of fact New England's interests and sympathies seemed to antagonize and separate her from the rest of the nation.

Her leaders, at least, were occupied from 1800 until after the War of 1812 in an extraordinary course of opposition to the government, in which they may have obeyed the letter of the law, but broke the spirit persistently, openly and defiantly.

After the War of 1812, Massachusetts turned its attention from incipient rebellion to manufacturing. This brought her in line with modern development and activities, destroyed her isolation, enlarged her sympathies, joined her interests with the growing west. Then the Federalist party in Massachusetts found itself with its cherished but antiquated ideals, its notions hopelessly at variance with the rest of the nation, as much out of date as the small clothes,

(9) Delaware is a possible exception. See Leutscher: *Early Pol. Machinery in the U. S.*, pp. 145-150.

three-cornered hats and perukes of the Colonial times, a period which it was seeking to perpetuate in government and society. And so, in the year 1825, its party existence practically came to an end.

But in each of these later phases the really vital elements which sustained the party are to an impressive degree the same social and religious influences which gave it birth and growth.

CHAPTER II.

POLITICAL PARTIES AND CONDITIONS IN MASSACHUSETTS, 1775-1780.

With the appeal to arms in 1775, the patriotic party¹ found itself without political opponents. From the Tory leaders shut up in Boston under the protection of Gage's army, no political opposition was to be feared.

Whatever remnant was left of this faction, the tide of sentiment was running too strongly for them openly to withstand it. Armed opposition was out of the question. The fate of the Mandamus Counsellors, the Addressors of Gage, and the Remonstrators to the Solemn League and Covenant left no courage to further provoke the anger of the people. The ease with which this party was excluded from the field of politics is explained by the fact that it was without a definite policy, without machinery of any sort, and had depended too entirely on the power of Great Britain and the supposed loyalty of her subjects in Massachusetts; while the triumph of the Whigs was due in large part to the political

(1) A direct outgrowth of the so-called popular party which had been more or less active since 1691. It had found ample occasion for the display of its talents, in the interminable warfare directed against the royal governor, which kept the relations in a constant condition of irritation. (Cushing: *Transition from Provincial to the Commonwealth Government in Mass.* Columbia Studies, VII: No. 1, pp. 20-7.) A great victory was won in the passage of the act erecting a Land Bank. (Douglas: *Financial Hist. of Mass.* Columbia Studies, I: No. 4, pp. 127-130. Felt: *Hist. Account of Mass. Currency*, pp. 107-8.) The weakness of the conservatives is shown in their failure to prevent this act. Only the interposition of Great Britain, by a parliamentary device, destroyed this dangerous proposition. The general lack of economic knowledge at this time is strikingly brought out by the attempt of the merchants—in the so-called Silver Scheme—(Wells: *S. Adams*, I:8) to remedy evils in monetary stringency by the same fallacious methods. By this time, 1740, it would seem that the lines between the popular and the conservative parties were being sharply drawn. It needed but Otis' speech on the Writs of Assistance to transform the popular into the patriotic party.

machinery which they developed with a completeness and effectiveness that has rarely been equalled.

To offset this wisely directed activity, the Loyalists did almost nothing to build up a party beyond the writing of newspaper articles and some pamphlets. They believed the reiterated and solemn protestations of the Whigs that nothing treasonable was contemplated; that nothing like independence was aimed at. They paid too little heed to the fact that in New England the ministers were still paramount; that the church and state were still closely united and that politics was as fully discussed in the pulpit as religion and morality.

Thus the skirmish at Lexington marked, as one of the political results, the destruction of the Tory party in Massachusetts, and when the fleet of Howe hastily left Boston harbor for Halifax on March 17th, 1776, it bore away with it the more active portion of that discredited and defeated party. The collapse of this party was so sudden and complete that it might be thought it had never possessed any real vitality. Such, however, was not the case. As far as actual voting strength went, its numbers were small, smaller indeed than in many of the colonies. But judging by the names of those who fled with Howe and those who were proscribed, it is clear that the party had wielded a great influence.² The number of Tories who remained in Massachusetts must have been inconsiderable. As the only British army which marched through Massachusetts was that of Burgoyne's, as prisoners of war, there was no opportunity for the manifestation of loyalty, such as was offered so frequently in many of the other states during the Revolution. Public opinion in Massachusetts was too nearly unanimous to allow any open

(2) Sabine: *Loyalists*, *passim*.

disaffection. Without doubt there were not a few who, fearing their neighbors more than their king, made a virtue of necessity, and paid their taxes and requisitions with feigned cheerfulness.³ Although impotent for mischief, rumor made them the authors of many a fancied plot, and, later, demagogues used the discredited name as a club to beat down the fair reputation of many a real patriot.

Despite the odium which still clings, perforce, to those sufferers for conviction's sake and bad judgment, we must recognize that the Tory minority, small as it was, embraced an important part of the education, ability, wealth and character of the colony. This element, essential in any government, is far more necessary in a republic, and especially in one which is in the process of formation. Whatever judgment history may pass upon the Whig attitude towards them and however it may question the expediency and justice of the legislation enacted during this period, it is undeniable that the lack of this element is clearly seen in the weakness of government, which existed in Massachusetts until the ratification of the Federal Constitution. Undoubtedly the slowness and unwillingness of the people to strengthen the hands of the state and Federal governments was at least partly due to the destruction of this same conservative element.

The axiom, that a party without opposition soon begins to disintegrate into its natural elements, was confirmed by the history of the patriot party from 1775 to 1780. When the war broke out, both politically and morally the party had reached its height. There was no further development of political machinery. That most formidable and successful extra-legal institution, the Committee of Correspondence,

(3) King to R. Southgate, Newburyport, Aug. 27, 1777. King had been accused of being a Tory. He lays down rules for avoiding suspicion. Among them are "the cheerfulness of paying your Taxes;" King: *King*, I:27.

lost its purely political aspect and became an indispensable adjunct to Congress and the Massachusetts legislature in carrying on the war. Led from 1765 to 1775 by a man who, whatever his faults, kept his eye single to a pure love for the rights of his country and democracy, by 1780 the party has become dominated by another whose chief recommendations are large pecuniary sacrifices and engaging personal qualities.

The fact that John Hancock could supplant Samuel Adams in the favor of the people, testifies to the degree of that demoralization which is usually attendant upon war. This cannot be fully attributed to the fickleness of the people. Neither is it due wholly to the excess of that spirit of democracy, which, under the leadership of Shays, was soon to threaten the existence of the state government. It was due more to a general lowering of morality, and the rise of a spirit of lawlessness bred by impatience of wholesome restraints, and the desire to live in a state of nature untrammelled by the duties of citizens.⁴ Common honesty was at a discount. Congress, as well as the states, set an evil example in disregarding obligations and plighted faith. Patriotism was made the pretext for the refusal to pay debts to British merchants. For the creditor to demand payment, was to be denounced as a Tory. Numerous were the estates of Loyalists which were bought for a song by ardent patriots. Forestalling was so commonly practiced that conventions of towns, the legislature and even the New England states in convention assembled, tried in vain to prohibit this iniquitous practice by regulating prices.⁵ As the war

(4) See F. E. Haynes (MS. Thesis, Harvard University) *The Struggle for the Constitution in Massachusetts*, for an account of chronic lawless attitude of the so-called "Berkshire Constitutionalists" throughout the War and of Hampshire County until 1777. See also Smith: *Hist. of Pittsfield*, Chaps. XVIII, XIX, XX.

(5) Barry: *Hist. of Mass.* III:134-5. Austin: *Gerry*, I:254, 259, 264. The clergy denounced this. See, e. g., Keltetlas, A., *Reflections on Extortion...* in a Sermon preached at Newburyport, 1788.

went on, large and increasing bounties had to be offered to obtain enlistments.⁶ In short, as a French officer, a capable observer, remarks in reference to Massachusetts, "Four years of war have somewhat strained the springs of patriotism . . . the commercial spirit and luxurious tastes are gradually stifling the love of independence. Republicans here, like Carthaginians, know to a penny the value of life and liberty."⁷

The disintegration made slow progress, for the heavy pressure of war kept the party together. A common sentiment for independence, even a common fear of defeat worked powerfully to keep differences in abeyance. Nova Scotia was uncomfortably near. The threatened return of plundered Loyalists stimulated to unwonted exertions of patriotism those in honest and peaceable possession of sequestered estates.⁸

Despite the fact that the all absorbing question of war quickly quenched any burning discussion over policies on which the party might split, yet in these five short years may be seen the beginning of the three parties which divided Massachusetts until the epoch of the French Revolution. The division in the Massachusetts delegates to Congress early became manifest. The feeling of resentment and jealousy toward Hancock, which the other delegates, notably Adams and Gerry, were unable to hide, struck a deeper note than personal dislike.⁹ It denoted the struggle for the first place in the confidence and affections of the people. Parties of that time, since

(6) Barry: Hist. of Mass. III:140-2. Austin: Gerry, I:254, 257-8, 394, footnote.

(7) Durand: Documents on the Am. Revolution, pp. 18-19.

(8) "A Bill lately passed the lower house for admitting them [the refugees] according to the Treaty, but it was stopped at the Senate...The clamors of a few, who have plundered their Effects, and fear their admission lest a restoration should be the consequence, wrought upon the timid..." S. Higginson to J. Adams, Dec. 30, 1785. Am. Hist. Assn. Rep. I (1896) 727. The same charge is made in the Centinel, Dec. 10, 1785.

(9) Wells: S. Adams, II:382-7.

they were largely devoid of political machinery, depended more on the personal popularity of their leaders.

Massachusetts, from 1630, has been dominated by the town and city of Boston, whose importance has always overshadowed the colony and state. Second only in importance to Boston, in point of abilities, was Essex county. The Revolution marked the end of one social order and the creation of another, and it was from Essex that the new leaders largely came.¹⁰ Social leadership was synonymous with political during the colonial period, and until the end of the federalist. The loss of the conservative elements was but slowly replaced, during the Revolution, by the gradual growth of a conviction that there was need of some check to the over-rapid advance of democracy, an advance which was destroying the efficiency of government. This feeling became crystallized in the famous Essex Junto.¹¹ Its members "more fully . . . represented the Puritan character . . . Strong, honest . . . they were sagacious in civil . . . life. But their intellectual vigor and clear perceptions were in many instances combined with great mental narrowness and rigidity."¹² Such were the men¹³ who, for nearly half a century in the political history of Massachusetts, had to be reckoned with, if not obeyed. It was this "Junto" to which John Adams ascribed his defeat. Jefferson, in the plenitude of his power, was humbled and defeated by it in his pet scheme of the Embargo. And if there was a definite attempt to sever New England from the Union, its instrumentality must be recognized.

(10) Memorial Hist. of Boston, III:191.

(11) For the origin of the name see Lodge: Cabot, pp. 19-22. To the writer's knowledge the first time that the name appeared in the newspapers was during the spring gubernatorial campaign of 1800. See, e. g., Ind. Ch., March 3, 1800.

(12) Lodge: Cabot, p. 18.

(13) The men who composed the "Junto" were Theophilus Parsons, George Cabot, Fisher Ames, Stephen Higginson, the Lovells, Timothy Pickering, Jonathan Jackson, Caleb Cushing, Tristram Dalton, Benjamin Goodhue, et al., all hailing from Essex County.

Isolated in New England, circumscribed by her narrow boundaries, the leaders were consumed by fierce hatred of Virginia and the South. In their feelings there was more than a tinge of religious bigotry.¹⁴ The Essex Junto shows the Federalist party at its best as well as at its worst.¹⁵

It was on April 15th, 1778, at Ipswich, at a meeting of delegates¹⁶ representing twelve towns of the county of Essex, that what may be called the birth of the Federalist party took place. This county convention seems to have been dominated by Theophilus Parsons, who, though a young man at that time, was yet thoroughly conversant with the principles of government, which are still accepted in the United States.¹⁷ The surprising fact is not that he was interested in polity, but that his discernment was so great at that early period. Not only in this county convention did he take the leading part, but he served with distinction in the state convention of 1780, which gathered together a noteworthy assemblage of statesmen.

To combat the proposed adoption of the constitution formulated by the legislature of Massachusetts, which had resolved itself into a convention for this express purpose, a committee of these delegates—Parsons, Goodale, and Putnam—were requested “to attempt to ascertain the true principles of government; to state the non-conformity of the constitution prepared by the convention of the state to those principles; and to delineate the outlines of a constitution conformable thereto; and report the same to

(14) See, e. g., the *Federal Spy*, May 11, 1802.

(15) It was “the extreme New England member of that brilliant, invaluable, intolerant and finally intolerable [Federalist] party.” *Am. Hist. Assn. Rep.* I (1896) 708.

(16) Parsons: Parsons, pp. 49-50. Of the twenty-seven delegates present, six achieved later a national fame and were prominent members of the Essex Junto:— R. Goodhue, T. Dalton, J. Jackson, T. Parsons, C. Cushing and J. Greenleaf.

(17) *Ibid.*, p. 48.

this body.”¹⁸ Their report was embodied in a pamphlet which is commonly called “The Essex Result.”¹⁹ This outline of the principles of government exposed the glaring deficiencies and weakness of the so-called Constitution of 1778.²⁰ It was so successful in this that it was largely instrumental in causing the rejection of the constitution by a large majority. But it was constructive also, for it drew up a system of government which was remarkable for its clear insight into the very nature and essence of a republican government. Except for its provisions concerning the weight that property should play in qualification for suffrage and office-holding, its principles are recognized as valid to-day as they were then.

It is interesting to note in the convention which drew up the Constitution of 1780, the fact that the conservatives were able to carry the day more in accordance with their wishes than with regard to the desires of those in favor of a weak and, in general, democratic government. The partial check to this latter tendency cannot be disguised. However, it was a long time before the federalists or believers in strong government could control the state. The roll call of the two committees which framed the two constitutions²¹ is sufficient to mark this change. In this Convention of 1779-80, the Essex Junto efficiently seconded John Adams’ scheme of government. To their aid John Adams bears a characteristic witness: “I had at first no support but from the Essex Junto, . . . they supported me timorously and at last would not go with me to so high a mark

(18) *Ibid.*, p. 51.

(19) *Ibid.*, pp. 47-51. It is given in entirety in *ibid.*, Appendix, No. 1, pp. 359-402.

(20) Cushing: *Transition from Provincial to Commonwealth Government in Massachusetts*. *Columbia Studies*. VII: No. 1, pp. 194-214.

(21) *Ibid.*, p. 208, footnote, p. 232, footnote, which refers to the *Journal of the Convention*, pp. 28-30.

as I aimed at, which was a complete negative in the governor upon all laws. They made me, however, draw up the constitution, and it was finally adopted, with some amendments very much for the worse. . . A foundation was here laid for much jealousy and unpopularity, against me, among the democratical people in this State.”²²

The first election for governor under the new state constitution was held on September 4th, 1780.²³ The vote is instructive.²⁴ It shows, on the one hand, the popularity of John Hancock, how completely he was master of the Whig party,²⁵ which had become the Popular or, better, the “Hancockonian party;” on the other hand, it shows just as clearly the weakness of the opposition elements. Hancock was opposed by two factions—for their number can hardly dignify them with the name of party—one having for its head James Bowdoin, the other being led by James Warren and Elbridge Gerry. At this time parties were without political machinery except of the crudest sort. Popularity rather than principle gave permanence and strength to a party. The Hancockonian party, which ruled Massachusetts until 1793, fell to pieces under the leadership of Samuel Adams, unable to withstand the loss of the popular leader. How, then, was John Hancock able not only to be elected governor when he chose, but to dictate who should be exalted and who should be abased in the affections of the people? As the ‘boss’ of the state until his death, he failed only once to carry out his own wishes.²⁶ In 1780 he blasted Samuel Adams’

(22) John Adams: Works, IX:618.

(23) Barry: Hist. of Mass., III:180.

(24) Hancock received 11,451 votes; Bowdoin, 1,141. MS. Massachusetts election returns.

(25) “Mr. Hancock kept aloof, in order to be governor.” John Adams: Works, IX:618.

(26) This was in 1785, when the Senate elected James Bowdoin as governor, instead of his candidate Cushing.

reputation for the time being.²⁷ His machinations against the latter were so successful, that even in his beloved home town of Boston, which he had ruled without a rival, Adams failed of election to the comparatively paltry office of the "Boston seat."²⁸ Hancock was elected governor until his death, except for two years,²⁹ when he declined the election because he apparently sensed the storm which arose and culminated under the leadership of Shays. In the year 1789, falling out with the lieutenant-governor in a quarrel, in which the legislature, at first through honesty, sided against him, he not only made the legislature face about, but he actually induced the people to elect another lieutenant-governor, Samuel Adams, the next year.³⁰ No man, who opposed him, prospered, where the people of the state had opportunity to express their predilections. Bowdoin, Samuel Adams, Lincoln, Warren and Gerry, men of ability, political experience, of fine principles and steady patriots beyond suspicion, were as nought in the eyes of the people unless Hancock sanctioned them. To the question whence came the astonishing ability to make or mar the political fortunes of all

(27) R. H. Lee to S. Adams, Philadelphia, Jan. 29, 1783: "you will not be a little surprised to hear that the following information was given to the House of Delegates in Virginia... 'that it was the public conversation at Philadelphia that there was a British Party on the continent, at the head of which [were] Messrs. Adams, Messrs. Lees & Mr. Laurens'...he [Col. Griffen] heard this report about two years ago in Boston, & lately in Philadelphia. That it came from Mr. Hancock's Party.'" S. Adams MSS., N. Y. Public Library. Besides this accusation, another which had great weight, was that Adams was connected with, if not the leader, of the Cabal, which was formed against Washington in the years 1777 to 1778. Wells: S. Adams, II:499-512. However, in 1781, Adams regained his popularity sufficiently to be elected to the legislature. *Continental Journal*, May 17, 1781.

(28) J. Warren to S. Adams, Boston, Nov. 2, 1780: "Neither your beloved town, the county, the State, nor the two Houses have shown any gratitude for your many and great services; and, in the choice of Secretary, [you] could not be supported in competition with Mr. A." This was Mr. John Avery, whose patriotism had not been conspicuous. Wells: S. Adams, III:116. J. Warren to S. Adams, Boston, Sept. 17, 1780: The elections "seem calculated for that interest and to render their Idol [Hancock] as uncontrollable as possible...the influence of all that don't worship devoutly may be very small, and you and I may have none at all." *Ibid.*, pp. 117-8. Also S. Adams to Gerry, Philadelphia, Nov. 27, 1780. Austin: Gerry, I:359-363.

(29) 1785, 1786.

(30) The defeat of Lincoln that year, at the polls, is a remarkable tribute to Hancock's mastery of the affections of the people.

men in the state, the answer is to be found above all in his surpassing reputation for patriotism.³¹ The first election turned on this very question as to which, Hancock or Bowdoin, had shown more. The former's sacrifices of property—which he could well afford—had been greater than that of any other man.

His unparalleled popularity³² was also due to his affable manners, to his hospitality, and to his position as the representative of the bygone colonial aristocracy.³³ However, popularity and patriotism were not the only means relied upon by Hancock to insure his power and the continuation thereof. Patronage, chiefly in the shape of justices of peace, was dispensed with a skillful and lavish hand.³⁴ His wealth, being freely used in the subtler forms of generous, not to say prodigal hospitality,³⁵ in no wise lessened his reputation. For his purse was always open to his "friends."³⁶ He does not seem to have been a man of sturdy principles, since his policy

(31) Hancock's reputation for patriotism was largely based, especially after the Revolution, on the famous order which excepted him and Samuel Adams from pardon. Wells: S. Adams, II:309-310. In addition his sacrifices and losses in Boston were not forgotten, while his presidency of the Continental Congress which adopted the Declaration of Independence enhanced his reputation immensely. Bowdoin of course had nothing so spectacular to offer.

(32) Hancock's popularity was not wholly a natural growth. One of his methods to gather and insure a surpassing popularity is discovered by Wm. Pynchon, June 25, 1778: "Mr. Hancock calls on his debtors and desires payment in paper currency, preferring that to silver money—the difference in the exchange being at 3½, and from that to 5 paper dollars for one of silver. Does Mr. H., . . . mean . . . to become popular and obtain votes at the choice of governor next May?" Diary, pp. 54-5. [In the Centinel, March 31, 1787, it is asserted that he sunk £26,000 in this way.] As the proposed Constitution of 1778 was defeated, Hancock's generosity went unrewarded until 1780.

(33) The great change which was to come over the attitude of the people in this respect, is shown by the assertion that Governor Gore lost his election in 1808 owing to his progress through the state in imposing style. Lunt: *Old New England Traits*, p. 216.

(34) This form of patronage was often exercised by the royal governors. See Gerry's slap at Hancock's methods. Austin: Gerry, I:363-4. Also *Continental Journal*, Nov. 29, 1781; *Ind. Ch.*, Jan. 24, 1782; *Salem Gazette*, Jan. 17, 24, 1782; Amory: Sullivan, I:110.

(35) Quincy: *Hist. of Harvard College*, II:207.

(36) "Did Brutus . . . in the infancy of the Commonwealth, and before any army of the Tarquins was subdued, acquire fame and popularity by largesses? No! These arts were reserved for Caesar, in the last expiring moments of the republic." Letter to Gerry. Austin: Gerry, I:279. See also *Am. Herald*, Dec. 3, 1787.

was to cater to the stronger party.³⁷ It is hard to judge of his abilities, for he wrote nothing and his chief advisors, Samuel Adams and James Sullivan, were unusually astute and clever politicians.³⁸

It was in James Bowdoin that the Essex Junto found a leader, whose sympathies and views largely coincided with their own. An early and firm patriot, his services in the Council had been invaluable, and his steady opposition to Hutchinson³⁹ had the greater weight, inasmuch as he was a conservative by nature, wealth, and position. His inability to accept the nomination to the first Continental Congress through the ill health of his wife and himself,⁴⁰ was made the basis for later totally unfounded charges against his patriotism.⁴¹ To Bowdoin must be assigned the highest praise for the admirable

(37) Surrounded from his entrance into politics by the shrewdest advisors, Hancock never made a serious false step. After some wavering, he espoused the Patriot cause. When the Declaration of Independence became inevitable, he was the first to sign. Wells: S. Adams, II:385. The excuse of his ill health elicited but scant sympathy from the "knowing ones" as early as 1781. In "1781, Mrs. Adams...wrote 'a repeal of the obnoxious tender act has passed the House and Senate. The Governor, as has been heretofore predicted, when anything not quite popular is in agitation, has the gout and is confined to bed.'" Adams: Three Episodes in Massachusetts History, II:892. See also T. Pickering to J. Adams, Aug. 6, 1822. Works, II:512.

(38) Whoever wrote the famous Amendments which Hancock presented to the Convention in 1788, no one claims the honor for Hancock. Parsons: Parsons, pp. 70-87. See Amory; Sullivan, I:222-4. However the Massachusetts federalists themselves were earlier sharply divided on this point. Hamilton: Works, I:476. As for his Boston Massacre Oration, opinion is divided between Dr. Cooper and Samuel Adams. Wells: Adams, II:138-140; Warren: Life of John Warren, p. 328. His messages to the legislature were said to be written by Dr. Cooper or Dr. Thatcher. Wm. Pynchon's Diary, p. 78; Warren: Life of John Warren, p. 328. Hancock evidently also made use of Dr. Warren's pen. Ibid, pp. 327-8. Even before the Revolution his lack of talents seems well known. Letter of J. Andrews, April 14, 1774: "Have inclos'd the anniversary oration delivered by Col. Hancock. Its generally allowed to be a good composition and asserted to be his own production..." Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc. 1864-65, p. 327. S. Breck to Knox, Boston, Jan. 30, 1791. Knox MSS. New England Historic Genealogical Society. [Hereafter all references to the Knox MSS. will have this Society understood.] "On Wednesday last...his Excellency the Governor deliver'd a lengthy Speech to both houses, it was a very good one...the question has been frequently asked, who wrote it—" John Adams is said to have called him "the empty barrel" in a moment of happy inspiration. Mem. Hist. of Boston, III:201. His more favorable comments were made in his old age and when Hancock's enemies had become his bitter foes. See Works, X:259-261; and Correspondence between Adams and Cunningham, p. 216.

(39) Wells: S. Adams, II:250. It is significant that Bowdoin's name is second on this "black list" (S. Adams being first), while Hancock comes ninth. See also *ibid*, I:466-7, 474.

(40) Adams: Familiar Letters of John Adams and his Wife, p. 63. Also S. Dexter to Bowdoin. Woodstock, Jan. 26, 1779. Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc. 1862-1863, pp. 359-360; Bowdoin to T. Pownall, Boston, May 17, 1779. Ibid, 1860-1862, pp. 241-4. Same to same, Boston, Nov. 20, 1783. Ibid, pp. 245-6.

(41) Continental Journal, May 4, 1781.

discharge of his duties as chief executive. The crushing of a rebellion for the avowed purpose of overturning or destroying the state government, in which at least two-thirds of the people were sympathetic and the legislature largely likewise, demanded the highest kind of ability, tact, firmness and moral stamina.⁴²

The third element was led by Elbridge Gerry and James Warren, and, up to the time of his reconciliation with Hancock, Samuel Adams. Until the agitation over the adoption of the Constitution put Gerry and Warren at the head of the antifederalists, these men were personal friends of Bowdoin.⁴³ While, in principle, these two factions were at opposite poles, yet they joined forces in fighting Hancock.⁴⁴ Gerry and Warren represented the stern and uncompromising republicanism of that day. They were later the out-and-out antifederalists. They disliked and feared Hancock, chiefly because they suspected in him a design to corrupt the people and to elevate himself to a position inconsistent with a republican form of government.⁴⁵

Such were the political forces and tendencies which divided Massachusetts in 1780.⁴⁶ Two of

(42) See Winthrop: Washington, Bowdoin and Franklin, Boston, 1876.

(43) In the letters of R. H. Lee and Gerry to Samuel Adams they constantly write in the following strain: "This is communicated in Confidence to yourself to be imparted only to Friends Mr. Higginson, Mr. Osgood and General Warren and Mr. Bowdoin." Gerry to S. Adams, Annapolis, May 7, 1784. S. Adams, Mss., N. Y. Public Library. Also Gerry to Bowdoin, New York, Dec. 6, 1785. Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., 7th Ser. VI. pt. 2, pp. 83-4. For the change in friendship with Warren see Adams: Life in a N. E. Town, pp. 128, 150.

(44) Austin: Gerry. I:354.

(45) *Ibid.*, I:359-365.

(46) "The state is divided into two parties; one calls itself Republican and is composed of everybody who holds office, and is led by Bowdoin and Adams . . . The opposition party, the true Republican party is led by Hanco(c)k. He is the King of the Rabble (Roi des Halles) or the American Beaufort. His credit, with the masses is great; his policy is shrewd and even crafty. He is the more opposed to Adams because they were once friends, and to Bowdoin because he is a rival. He befriends us only because he hates them." Durand: Docs. on the Am. Rev., pp. 18-19. Supposed to have been written by Chevallier de Fleury, a French officer stationed in America in 1779. See Stevens' Facsimiles, No. 1616, where the original as well as a translation of the document is given. For another view of the leaders in Massachusetts see *Ibid.*, No. 487.

This rivalry between Hancock and Bowdoin extended to the choosing of a clergyman at "Dr. Cooper's." J. Elliot to J. Belknap, Boston, Feb. 6, 1784. Belknap Papers. Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., 6th Ser. IV. pt. III, pp. 270-1. See for the beginning of the rivalry, Quincy: Hist. of Harvard College, II: 207.

these parties being founded on principles were destined to survive. Bowdoin and his friends became the Federalist party. Gerry and his friends became first Antifederalists and afterwards led the Democratic-Republican party.

By general consent there were two men, and two only, who were candidates for the first gubernatorial honors. The decision of the people lay between Hancock and Bowdoin.⁴⁷ Gerry never received a large popular vote until party discipline had become more perfected and party machinery more developed. So overwhelming was the vote for Hancock,⁴⁸ the opposition elements acquiesced in the emphatic decision of the people, and Bowdoin, whose health seemed to forbid any such strain, declined the lieutenant-governorship in a handsome letter to the legislature.⁴⁹ His resignation was based on his unquestioned ill health, for there follow at that time no accusations or charges of pique or ill feeling. It was quite otherwise with James Warren, who also refused that office.⁵⁰ He was compelled in his letter of refusal to deny the insinuations made against him of hostility towards the new governor.⁵¹ The election seems to have given general satisfaction

(47) J. Adams: Works, IX: 511; Adams: Familiar Letters of John Adams and his Wife, pp. 176-7.

(48) The electioneering, if there was much, was not carried on in the newspapers. The only appeal in the *Massachusetts Spy* is apparently aimed against Hancock: "Consider it not the business of election to repair injured fortunes [Hancock's had suffered severely during the war], nor to reward past services . . . Let not the question be who has, but who will, best advance the general interest." Aug. 31, 1780. The only reference to the election itself in the *Worcester paper* is that in Boston town meeting Hancock had "858 votes out of 923." No mention is made of the vote in Worcester. *Mass. Spy*, Sept. 14, 1780.

(49) *Ibid.*, Nov. 9, 1780.

(50) It took nearly three weeks to elect a lieutenant-governor. Oct. 25, 1780. p. 11. Announcement that there is no choice by the people. Oct. 27, p. 18. The House sends up Bowdoin and Azor Orne. Senate elects Bowdoin. Oct. 31, p. 37. This day Bowdoin declines both the election to the lieutenant-governorship and to the Senate. Nov. 7, p. 69. J. Warren and Azor Orne sent up to the Senate. p. 72. Warren is elected. Nov. 8, p. 80. Warren desires a few days for consideration. Nov. 10, p. 87. Declines, Nov. 13, p. 96. T. Cushing and Artemas Ward sent up. Nov. 14, p. 97. Senate chooses T. Cushing. Nov. 14, p. 98. *MS. House Journal*, 1780-1781. This ended the search for lieutenant-governor, for Cushing accepted.

(51) *Mass. Spy*, Nov. 23, 1780. This letter was dated Nov. 10th.

and Hancock was the recipient of a number of addresses of congratulation from numerous associations, commercial as well as judicial.⁵²

(52) See the Mass. Spy, Oct. 26, Dec. 6, 1780. For a full and lively account of the inaugural ceremonies, see Gordon: Hist. of the Independence of Am. III: 497-9.

CHAPTER III.

THE PARTIES OF HANCOCK AND BOWDOIN. SHAYS' REBELLION.

In the financial troubles, which plagued the country and especially Massachusetts during and after the Revolution, is to be found the chief reason for the growth of the conservative wing which Bowdoin led. For the first five years of the state government in Massachusetts, Hancock was elected by large majorities.¹ Nevertheless, the opposition increased slowly but surely, and the cause seems to have been the dissatisfaction of the creditor class, due to the unwillingness of the dominant party to take effectual means for the restoration of the public credit.² That class, however, which earliest identified itself with those who held that Congress needed greater powers was the merchant class. This order saw clearly the uselessness of efforts on the part of a single state to regulate commerce. Therefore, when in 1784 the question of the five per cent. impost was before the legislature, the members took sides as what may be called a "Federal" or an "Antifederal" party;³ and the merchants as a rule were "Federalists."

The importance of the election for governor in 1785 was fourfold. In the first place it developed such an acrimonious party spirit that the harmony, which had outwardly prevailed up to this time, was completely at an end. Secondly it revealed the conservative forces as a strong, able and aggressive

(1) The following vote for governor was cast in 1781. Total vote, 8585: Hancock, 7996; Bowdoin, 304. In 1782, total vote, 7744: Hancock, 5855; Bowdoin, 1155. The votes for 1783 and 1784 were not recorded. [See Bibliography.] Judging by the accessible votes, not only was great apathy shown, but Hancock was posing popularity. However, the opposition was rather well scattered.

(2) Sullivan to B. Lincoln, Aug. 4, 1781. Amory: Sullivan, II: 381.

(3) King: King, I: 14-15, foot note.

party, though still greatly in the minority; and it welded them together, so that, when the struggle over the adoption of the Constitution came, they were able to work more effectually. In the third place, the telling charge of Toryism was revived as a political weapon. Finally it gave the first and only check to the influence of Hancock. This, however, was but temporary. In fact, the extravagance of the accusations recoiled upon the heads of the accusers and enhanced the popularity of the people's idol.

Of Hancock's political sagacity and foresight, there is no better proof than his resignation early in 1785.⁴ It was in every way opportune, for the economic situation of both the people and the state of Massachusetts was well nigh desperate. This was due to several causes. One, and by no means the least important, was the failure during the past year to collect the taxes. Large arrears were still owing from previous years. How much of this negligence is chargeable to Hancock and his administration and how much to the difficulties of circumstances, is not certain. At any rate the treasury of the Commonwealth was nearly empty. Beset by the impatient creditors of the state on the one side, and on the other, frightened by the angry mutterings of the poverty stricken and distressed people in the back counties,⁵ Hancock became convinced that his precarious health rendered him unfit to occupy the exposed position of governor in the face of the oncoming storm. Accordingly, on January 29th, his resignation was tendered to the legislature.⁶ His

(4) Salem Gazette, March 1, 1785.

(5) Since the beginning of the Revolution the inhabitants of western Massachusetts had not been great respecters of the law. In addition to their refusal to permit courts to convene at various times, lawless outbreaks had taken place, notably in 1782 and 1783. The danger of serious uprisings was perceived by many thoughtful persons. N. Dane to King, Oct. 8, 1785: "We all believe our Continental Government may in time be amended . . . particularly as to the mode of suppressing revolts in the respective governments." King: King, I:70.

(6) Gerry to King, Boston, March 28, 1785. Gives a curious account of the resignation. King: King, I:76. Also C. Gore to King, Boston, March 20, 1785. *Ibid.*, I: 81.

action was exceedingly well timed. It gave ample space for the lieutenant-governor, Cushing, the man whom he had chosen for his successor, to become acquainted with his duties, and likewise for the people to "become accustomed to the thought of him as governor.

The withdrawal of Hancock offered the first real opportunity to the friends of Bowdoin to elevate their favorite to the gubernatorial chair. However, until the eve of election, the contest, to judge from the newspapers, was just the sort of a mild and dignified affair that had been customary up to this year. But suddenly Hancock and his party seemed to have awakened to the fact that Cushing was in grave danger of losing the election. Furious attacks were begun at once on everything British—the "British factors"⁷ being the especial point of attack. Bowdoin was assailed as a Tory, and denounced bitterly because of his relationship with John Temple.⁸ Vigorous were the attempts made to revive the old excitements and methods of the pre-Revolutionary days. The aid of the "Mohawk Indians" was offered to expel the obnoxious British agents,⁹ and hardly a voice was raised in defence of this hated class.

(7) "Every capitol is crowded with British agents, sent over to collect debts contracted long before the war, oppress the debtor, and purchase the public securities from all persons whose necessities oblige them to sell, at the monstrous discount of seventeen shillings and six pence on the pound." Warren, *Hist. of the Am. Revolution*, III:344. Another view is: "Those [London merchants] . . . who still have a hankering after it [American trade], apprized by woeful experience of the risks their property is exposed to in the hands of American Merchants, use the precaution of sending out supercargoes and agents; and this . . . is . . . one of the principle grievances which the pious people of Boston labor under." *Am. Herald*, July 18, 1785, from the *Bahama Gazette*. See also *ibid.*, Jan. 16, 1786, from a late London paper.

(8) John Temple was Bowdoin's son-in-law. Although a native born American, he had spent nearly all his mature life in England rendering valuable services to America during and before the war. But he was suspected in 1778 of bringing proposals for peace from Great Britain. He was accused of being a Tory and had great trouble in gaining permission to reside in Massachusetts in 1782. Bowdoin and his friends naturally espoused Temple's cause. This contest but deepened the conflict between Hancock and Bowdoin. Amory: *Sullivan*, I: 134-8; II: 388; *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll. 6th Ser. IX: XV-XVII*. See *Plain Statement of Facts and Dates concerning Mr. Temple* [Signed "Narrator"], and *A Statement refuting certain Statements in James Sullivan's Charges against Mr. Temple*. Boston, May 25, 1783. Copies are in the Massachusetts Historical Society.

(9) *Centinel*, April 9, 1785.

This rancorous method of campaigning naturally led to bitter resentment and retaliation.¹⁰ Disdaining to pay attention to Cushing¹¹—who was simply denounced, in passing, as a servile tool—the attack singled out as the real leader of the campaign of defamation, Hancock.¹² In unsparing terms, his weaknesses were set forth and his “boss rule” denounced.¹³ At the same time Bowdoin’s patriotism, which had been decried and even called in question, was stoutly maintained.¹⁴

The popular election did not settle the question—the law demanding a majority vote—for Bowdoin received 3,519 votes, Cushing 3,005.¹⁵ The decision, therefore, went to the legislature. The agitation against the “British factors” began anew.¹⁶ It is difficult to avoid the suspicion that this campaign of agitation and boycotting had more a political end in view than anything else.¹⁷ It was early found easier

(10) *Ibid.*, March 26, 1785. *Am. Herald*, March 28, 1785. A hand bill was circulated by Bowdoin’s friends just before the date of election, (A copy is in the Mass. Historical Society.) addressed “To the Honest Electors of this Day.” It is chiefly a eulogy of Bowdoin but also contains some cautious hints: “Be cool, my Friends . . . lest you be misguided . . . It may be by Sycophants and Parasites, by near Relations, or by interested Persons, who have enjoyed emoluments from the gracious Hands which your own former suffrage put in the power of their Patrons to extend.”

(11) Gerry to King, Marblehead, April 7, 1785. King: King, I: 86-7. C. Gore to King, Boston, March 20, 1785, *ibid.*, p. 81.

(12) *Am. Herald*, April 4, 1785.

(13) It is evident that Stephen Higginson is the leader in this campaign against Hancock. At best Higginson was unpopular on account of his connection with British merchants. He is denounced in most violent terms as the “Salem Wizard.” *Am. Herald*, April 11, 1785. Also in the *Centinel*, May 7, 1785; April 11, 1789. Judging from the phraseology and the facts, it is probable that “Civis” is none other than Higginson, for the resemblance between these two long articles and the famous attacks on Hancock by “Laco” is marked. *Continental Journal*, May 19, 26, June 2, 1785. There are also in the *Centinel*—May 21, 25, 1785—two articles by “Philo-Civis” and a “Brother Elector” which are of the same tenor. It is certain, however, that whereas before this he had been elected to the legislature and a delegate to Congress, he never had an office after this time. Gerry to King, Boston, May 19, 1785: “H. [ancock] is attacked in very plain terms . . . Civis . . . is well informed of H.’s [Hancock’s] pretensions to Merit.” King: King, I: 99.

(14) *Am. Herald*, April 4, 1785.

(15) MS. Mass. election returns. The total vote was 9,065.

(16) *Centinel*, April 9, 13, 16, 1785.

(17) 1. Hancock is moderator of the meeting which is held to discourage these British factors and the excitement subsides after the legislature makes its choice. 2. A great struggle takes place in Boston over the two lists, chiefly, it would seem, because Hancock is on one of them. 3. On May 25th, the day before the election in the legislature, there comes out in the *Centinel* an elaborate account of the funeral procession of the “Bowdoinish Coalition which will parade at 4 o’clock.” 4. It is only after this election that Hancock publishes a letter in which he deprecates the attacks on Bowdoin and disavows any connection with them.

to bring pressure to bear upon the legislature than upon the voters at large. On April 15th, "a meeting of merchants, traders, and many other gentlemen of the town" was held in Boston—Hancock presiding as moderator—to consider what discouragements should be given to "British factors."¹⁸ The results of the deliberations recall pre-revolutionary meetings, boycotts,¹⁹ committees to correspond with the merchants in the seaports, a petition to Congress, a committee to wait upon those who rented any place to factors²⁰—in short, all the machinery so effectual a decade before was set in motion.²¹

The battle was now transferred to the election of Boston's representatives to the legislature.²² The lines were sharply drawn on the two lists prepared.²³ Great alarm was aroused in Bowdoin's friends over the fact that Hancock was nominated as one of the "Boston Seat," since it was asserted that a deep laid plot was maturing for the exclusion of Bowdoin

(18) Salem Gazette, April 19, 1785. How thorough going the intentions were can be gleaned from two letters of Knox. The first on April 18, 1785, to H. Jackson: The Merchants "resolved...to have no dealings whatever with any British Merc.¹ Agents or Factors that do or may reside in this State—that we will not receive them to Board—Speak, or have any connections with them...not let them a House Shops—Stores, or Wharfe—no Truckman to truck for them, unless to carry their goods on board some vessel to transport them out of the State in consequence...the poor D—ls are packing up..." Knox MSS. XVIII:21. The other shows less unanimity. To Gibbs, April 21: "the Trades met today to consider what is to be done...on their part as there seems to be a Jarr between the Merchantile Interests & others...the Selectmen met this morning to point out who of the British...Factors &c. continue among us." Ibid. XVIII:23.

(19) In the newspaper advertisements of dry goods in April and May, it is significant that the word "European" is used almost exclusively. See a mock advertisement of "Whackum & Co." Centinel, May 4, 1785: "N. B. Those who through an ill-timed fear, have come in at the back door may now avoid such unnecessary precautions." [This "Whackum & Co." was a certain Lewis & Co. Ibid. Jan. 31, 1789.] See a violent attack by "Joyce, Jun" on "THOSE PERSONS WHO CLANDESTINELY received prohibited goods at Two o'clock on Saturday Night." Am. Herald, May 2, 1785.

(20) The program of the "Patriots" encountered many snags. See the Am. Herald, May 2, 9, 1785; Centinel, April 30, May 4, 1785; but their chief difficulty was with the "ladies...whose unpardonable desire to purchase their [British factors'] accursed commodities and who to gratify their immoderate attachment to dress, would willingly sacrifice the community." Knox to Jackson, Boston, May 1, 1785: "the fire and wrath against Whackum & others is much abated." Knox MSS. XVIII:29.

(21) Salem Gazette, May 3, 1785. Ships loaded with British goods were not permitted to land their cargoes. Am. Herald, May 16, 1785.

(22) Ibid. April 25, 1785. See also the Centinel, April 27, 1785.

(23) Ibid. May 7, 1785.

from the chair.²⁴ Another rumor was bruited about that after being elected, Cushing would decline in favor of Hancock.²⁵ The vote of the House was in favor of Cushing, 134 to 89,²⁶ but the Senate insisted on Bowdoin by a vote of 18 to 10,²⁷ and the House acquiesced.²⁸

The disturbed state of trade with foreign nations gave Bowdoin the opportunity to address the legislature on the measures called for by the situation.²⁹ His message, the 31st of May, 1785,³⁰ has the high distinction of being the first step taken in an official way to hold a convention for the purpose of giving greater powers to the government of the union. His words are quite worth while quoting. After reciting the difficulties under which commerce in the United States labored, he goes on to say: "The United States have the same right, and can, and ought to regulate their foreign trade...it is a misfortune that Congress have not yet been authorized for that purpose by all the states...It is of great importance, and the happiness of the United States depends upon it that Congress should be vested with all the powers necessary to preserve the Union, to manage the general concerns of it, and secure and promote its common interest. That interest...the Confederation does not sufficiently provide for; ...This matter, gentlemen, merits your attention; and if you think that Congress should be vested with ampler powers, and that special delegates from the states should be

(24) *Ibid.*, May 14, 1785.

(25) *Ibid.*, May 25, 1785.

(26) *Am. Herald*, June 27, 1785.

(27) Gerry to King, Boston, May 27, 1785: "I most heartily congratulate you on the . . . election of Mr. Bowdoin. The most vigorous Exertions were made on both sides, & he was sent up by 86 votes . . . the Senate being doubtful, they appointed me a Member and . . . (being) notified . . . at Marblehead about five o'clock yesterday morning, I came . . . to take my seat . . ." King: *King*, 1:100.

(28) *Centinel*, May 28, 1785; *Salem Gazette*, May 31, 1785.

(29) The regulation of commerce through a general union of the colonies was advocated by Bowdoin as early as 1754. Winthrop: *Address on James Bowdoin*, pp. 15-17.

(30) *Salem Gazette*, June 7, 1785.

convened to settle and define them, you will take the necessary measures for obtaining such a Convention or Congress, whose agreement, when confirmed by the states, would ascertain these powers."³¹ As a result of this message the legislature passed, on July 1st, a series of resolutions embodying Bowdoin's recommendations.³² On the same day the governor enclosed these in a letter, which he forwarded to the Massachusetts delegates in Congress.³³ Likewise he wrote to the governors of the other states, asking that they use their best offices, should these resolutions be acted upon by Congress, in enlisting the support of their respective states.³⁴ The fate of this communication is interesting. Bowdoin's letter of July 1st reached the delegates Gerry, Holten, and King the first of August! In their reply of August 18th they admit that "we have delayed any communication with Congress upon this subject. . . We are sensible that our duty points out a prompt and exact obedience to the acts and instructions of the legislature, but if a case arises wherein we discover most clearly consequences so fatal that, had they been known, perhaps the measure adopted would not have been proposed, it may not be improper to delay a final execution until we have the instructions of the Legislature after such pernicious consequences of the measure shall have been submitted to their examination."³⁵ This letter is followed by another of the third of September, which contains a very able and full exposition of the delegates' attitude.³⁶ It presents in the clearest light the views of men who had no conception, at that time, of a nation; who were morbidly afraid of more than a semblance of

(31) Winthrop: Address on James Bowdoin, pp. 39-41.

(32) *Ibid.*, p. 41.

(33) King: King, 1:58.

(34) *Ibid.*

(35) *Ibid.*, pp. 59-60.

(36) *Ibid.*, pp. 60-6.

power in government; in short, it was an admirable anti-federal document. The results of this communication were that the legislature adopted the views of the delegates and suspended their resolutions.³⁷ As a matter of fact, the action of the legislature does not, as might be supposed, indicate any great growth of federal sentiment from the previous year, when the legislature defeated the request of Congress to grant them a five per cent. impost. It seems rather to be an outcome of the agitation over the commercial interests,³⁸ which, in Massachusetts, took the peculiar form of an attack upon "British factors" and anyone supposed to be connected with Great Britain.³⁹

Bowdoin's attempt, then, for a convention of the states had no practical result, except as it produced an impression on the minds of thoughtful and sober men, which bore fruit later. But a special event was soon to display the weakness of Congress and the perils to which government, state as well as federal, was exposed under the confederation. This event was Shays' Rebellion.

The financial condition of the people as well as the state of Massachusetts at the close of the Revolution was deplorable.⁴⁰ But the inflation of the currency⁴¹—one of the chief expedients for easing the

(37) *Ibid.*, p. 66.

(38) Letter of N. Dane to King, Boston, Oct. 8, 1785. *Ibid.*, pp. 67-70.

(39) Still in the newspapers as elsewhere the demand for a stronger government grew. See e. g. *Salem Gazette*, Feb. 20, 1783. Knox writes to Washington, Boston, Feb. 29, 1784, (Knox MSS. XVII:21) "most sensible men see the importance of the powers of the union being higher [higher] braced—but no measures are proposed to effect it." See also *Am. Herald*, Feb. 28, 1785; *Centinel*, April 20, 1785; *Am. Herald*, April 25, 1785; *Centinel*, Feb. 4, 1786, is noteworthy: "Who that is a real citizen of America, can sit unconcerned, and see the piddling members of some Legislature, debating whether they shall (grant, as they absurdly term it) comply with the requisitions of Congress. With equal absurdity, might every town upon the receipt of a tax bill, first debate whether it was proper, they should grant said tax." The writer was Col. Joseph Ward. (See Jackson: *Hist. of Newton*, p. 551.) Also *Mass. Gazette*, April 24, May 1, 1786; *Am. Herald*, July 10, 1786; *Mass. Gazette*, Feb. 16, 1787, from the *Ind. Ch.*

(40) Minot: *Hist. of Shays' Rebellion*, pp. 5-14; Amory: *Sullivan*, II:380-4.

(41) "Labor is generally considered . . . as the most certain standard . . . it is well known, that the same . . . number of dollars will now purchase twice as

burdens of the debtor—disguised this fact so fully that it increased their indebtedness and only made the crash the harder when finally the hour of reckoning came. To remedy the scarcity of hard money which was felt at the beginning of the war and most acutely at and after its close, the legislature passed, July 3d, 1782, what is known as the Tender Act,⁴² which made cattle and other kinds of property legal tender in the discharge of debts. The effect of this was twofold: it marked the beginning of a deepening hatred between those who had and those who had not, and it postponed the suits for judgment against debtors, thus increasing the total indebtedness.⁴³ The act expired in the year following.⁴⁴

The anger of the people was first turned toward the officers who had accepted half pay for life.⁴⁵ After measures had been adopted which involved the appreciation of the various issues of depreciated paper currency, the debtor classes raised a great

much labor as it would have done in 1781, or 1782." *Am. Herald*, Feb. 5, 1787. "Both merchant goods and country produce now fetches double in hard money what they did before the war . . ." *Mass. Spy*, Jan. 18, 1781. "The people universally, have had their situation altered, for the worse, within four years past; money has been very plenty, and credit profuse, they contracted debts which they are rendered unable to pay without distress, because their property does not purchase half so much money as the same quantity did when the debt was contracted." *Mass. Gazette*, Oct. 24, 1786. "The rage for privateering and traffic, by which some had suddenly grown rich, had induced others . . . [to sell] the patrimonial inheritance for trifling considerations, in order to raise ready specie for adventure in some speculative project." Warren: *Hist. of the Am. Revolution*, III:343. See also *Boston Magazine*, Dec. 1785; *Centinel*, Feb. 22, 1786.

(42) *Minot*: p. 14.

(43) *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.

(44) *Ibid.*, p. 4. Attacks upon the act are in the *Mass. Spy*, Jan. 11, 1781; *Boston Gazette*, May 17, 1784. To quiet part of the grievances of the people a new Tender Act, was passed with a great deal of effort, only after the Senate at first had refused to concur. See *Minot*: p. 59; and T. Dalton to—, Nov. 6, 1786. *Essex Inst. Hist. Coll.* XXV:18. The act had the natural result of raising interest rates above the legal limit. *Centinel*, May 20, 1788. The next year an attempt was made to lengthen the time of the act, which was not successful. *Centinel*, Nov. 7, 14, 1787. See also *ibid.*, Oct. 17, 1787. It expired March 12, 1788. (*Centinel*, of same date). The same month another vain attempt was made to pass a Tender Law. *Ibid.*, March 26, 29, 1788.

(45) *Ind. Ch.*, March 14th, 1782. In Connecticut the feeling was even stronger. Col. Humphrey to Knox, Hartford, Conn., Sept. 25, 1786. *Knox MSS.* XIX:18: "There seems to be some favorable alteration in the sentiment of the people; nothing need be a stronger proof of this, than the appointment of Major Todd to a seat in the Assembly, by a town, from which three years ago, he was obliged, literally to fly for his life on account of commutation." See the *Mass. Gazette*, Jan. 9, 1786, for the changed attitude in Massachusetts.

outcry. They became inflamed against the creditor classes and the holders of securities.⁴⁶ One result of these commotions in the public mind was to start into renewed activity the system of county conventions.⁴⁷ These conventions had been an efficient aid to government and a useful method of giving voice to public opinion during the period when there was no constitution, but now they were used to foment sedition and even rebellion.⁴⁸ They often seemed to precede some outrage upon the lawful and constituted authorities of the state. Their method and their ostensible purpose was to formulate a list of grievances which they wished redressed by the legislatures. The burden of their complaints show conclusively to what extremes unchecked and unregulated democracy can go. Taking as a fair example

(46) Salem Gazette, April 11, 1784; Am. Herald, May 16, 1785. The Hampshire Herald had a series of articles by "Publick Faith," who assumed this dishonest attitude, which were quoted widely even in the Centinel, Feb. 8, 11, March 1, 1787. "A Friend to the Community" answers in *ibid.*, March 4, 8, 1786. See also "Jockey, jun." in *ibid.*, Feb. 11, 1786. A violent attack is in the Centinel, Feb. 18, 1786: "Nor would the piece [Publick Faith] . . . have occasioned such 'HIDEOUS ROARINGS,' had it not contained such 'damning proofs,' of rectitude, as to make those who have amassed an immense hoard of Publick Securities for a mere song, TREMBLE for their cheap-bought wealth."

Times were undeniably hard and taxes heavy. There was a great deal of discontent, money was very scarce, so much so, that hardly "a dollar is collected at Communion." William Pynchon's Diary, p. 231. See also p. 233. The state government was likewise afflicted. See letter of Bowdoin to Gen. Shephard, Jan. 21, 1787. Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll. 7th Ser. 6:129-130. In September, 1784, the estates of no less than seven of the tax collectors in Hampshire county were for sale, and further accounts of the distress mention the bad crops for the last three or four years. Salem Gazette, Sept. 14, 1784. The manner of raising the tax was very inequitable, the polls carrying so large a part of the burden. As the Am. Herald—Feb. 26, 1787—said: "human nature revolts at the idea of a sixth part of a year's earnings being wrested from the wretched individual for the sake of this political protection:—and yet this poll tax . . . has been nearly if not quite equal to this enormous burthen." An illuminating letter is in the Hampshire Gazette, March 12, 1794: "within five years and many antecedent . . . the agriculture interest was at the mercy of the Traders, Drovers . . . payments were not made in money; but in trumpery [things] . . . money to pay our taxes could not be obtained; and the price of the property turned out to the threats of the collector was entirely under his controul . . ."

The exactions of the lawyers were truly unbearable. See the strictures upon the customs of the law at that period in Parsons; Parsons, p. 192. Even the loyal town of Newton in its instructions to its legislative representative, reproaches in the strongest terms the iniquitous practices of the law, citing as grievances "delays, frequent appeals, protraction of judgment, loss of time and travel in attendance, and intolerable expense . . . so that . . . it is better to lose [a case often] . . . than to seek a recovery at law." Smith: Hist. of Newton, pp. 386-7.

The letters of the Marquise of Buckingham to Sir John Temple portray in sombre colors the hopeless condition of American trade from an English standpoint. Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc. 1866-7, pp. 71-2.

(47) Hist. Mag. IV, 2nd ser., p. 257.

(48) See Appendix A.

the grievances and resolutions of the Hatfield Convention,⁴⁹ it becomes clear, that the people desired not a republican government, but a democratic one, as is evidenced by their proposal to do away with the Senate, to make the officers of government dependent on the legislature through annual appropriations for their salaries, and to make all the civil officers of government dependent on the representatives of the people through annual election by the legislature. They also demanded an immediate revision of the constitution, in order to remedy permanently the many grievances of which they complained. In other lines they wished a Tender law, a bank of paper money subject to a regular depreciation and the removal of the legislature from the contaminating influence of Boston. They wished to abolish the courts of Common Pleas and General Sessions of the Peace, and to reform in a drastic way the Fee Table and the methods of practice of the lawyers. They put forth various schemes for the amelioration of taxation.⁵⁰ The utterances of the Hatfield Convention⁵¹ are typical; they disclose fully both the destructive and constructive aims of the malcontents. Of course the men of wealth and position regarded this whole commotion as a wicked

(49) Aug. 22nd to 25th, 1786. Minot, p. 33. This is the most famous of the conventions of this period, which met for the purpose of redressing grievances with resolutions—or with clubs and arms.

(50) There were twenty articles voted. For an extended account see Minot, pp. 33-6. The Leicester county convention of 37 delegates—the Hatfield had fifty towns represented from Hampshire County—held May 15th, 1786, (adjourned to the last Tuesday in September) presented eight chief grievances: 1. Holding of the legislature in Boston. 2. Want of a circulating medium. 3. Extortion of the fee-table. 4. Court of Common Pleas. 5. The appropriation of the impost and excise duties to the payment of the interest of the state debt (i. e. repudiation.) 6. The grants made by the legislature "to the Attorney General & others." 7. Too many office-holders and too large salaries. 8. "The State furnishing money to Congress while our account with Congress remains unsettled."

(51) By adjournment this convention met on January 2nd, 1787, but so often had these conventions been followed by armed mobs and since matters had proceeded so far that they were only to be settled by arms, the convention accomplished nothing. In the Centinel for Jan. 20th, 1787, which publishes its address there, is also a mock funeral procession ridiculing its members, aims, and failure.

attempt to seize property and to level all distinctions.⁵² This latter charge, which is made again and again, is interesting.⁵³ It shows that society, having been greatly weakened in its upper strata, had lost its equilibrium and was undergoing a violent agitation. The social rigidity, which had developed earlier was broken down. Different elements were struggling upward. The representatives of the new aristocracy, conscious that their position was not yet assured and that the people were moved to be a law unto themselves, felt most bitterly in regard to the common mass of people who were not disposed

(52) T. Sedgwick to King, Boston, June 18, 1787: "A war is now actually levied on the virtue, property and distinctions in the Community..." King: King, I:224. The movement toward levelling sprang from Revolutionary times. J. Sullivan to J. Adams, March 9, 1776. Amory: Sullivan, I:77. It was bewailed "that a spirit of dress and show...at present sets out the shop-boy in such a style, that it is hardly possible to distinguish between him and the first merchant in the city." *Continental Journal*, July 7, 1785. And anguish was caused "in one of our polite circles...[because] it is impossible to distinguish by their dress a lady worth £100 from one worth £10,000." *Am. Herald*, June 13, 1785.

(53) Knox to Washington, New York, Oct. 23, 1786: "they [the insurgents] feel at once their own poverty compared with the opulent, and their own force, and they are determined to make use of the latter in order to remedy the former." Drake: Knox, p. 91. S. Higginson to N. Dane, Boston, March 3, 1787: "the people . . . have too high a taste for luxury and dissipation, to sit down contented in their proper line, when they see others possessed of much more property than themselves. with these feelings and sentiments, they will not be quiet while such distinctions exist as to rank and property; and sensible of their own force they will not rest easy till they possess the reins of Government, and have divided property with their betters, or they shall be compelled by force to submit to their proper stations and mode of living." *Am. Hist. Assn. Rep.* I (1896) 754. King to Kilham, N. Y., Oct. 29, 1786. King: King, II:612: The "leaders" of the Insurgents "publicly avow . . . that all America . . . was acquired by the people [']s] . . . joint exertions; that all men being by nature equal, the Property ought to be equally divided among [them] . . . and [therefore] . . . all debts contracted before [the Revolution] . . . are annihilated and any attempts to enforce their payment are . . . plunder and robbery."

The attitude of the sympathizers with the oppressed malcontents is outlined by a writer in the *Mass. Gazette*, Oct. 20, 1786—from the (October) *Worcester Magazine*—in answer to a writer in the August 22d, 25th issues: "When we had other Rulers, committees and conventions of the people were lawful . . . Has he forgot how lately this commonwealth has shaken off its oppressors and will the virtuous yeomanry who disdained to stoop to foreign tyrants, now bow . . . to internal despots. Let such . . . remember the fate of their predecessors and tremble . . . the first petition from Congress was treated in the same manner by them that the petition from the Convention in the county of Bristol was by the late General Court...It is certainly time there was a change." It was maddening to the poverty stricken people to see "more money lavished by one single grant of the General Court on [James Sullivan, the attorney-general] . . . who has rendered himself generally disagreeable to the people, than can be obtained by a life of industrious labour..." Fourth demand in the petition of the Worcester County Convention of October, 1786. Published in the *Mass. Gazette*, Oct. 17, 1786.

to grant them homage or obedience. Shays' Rebellion was the result of the poisoning and blighting, by hardships, of this strong democratic movement. This outbreak marks the height of the democratic tide in western Massachusetts.⁵⁴

Although it only lasted from 1786 to 1787⁵⁵ conditions had been ripening since the pre-revolutionary days.⁵⁶ The stoppage of the courts by mobs in 1774, and the blow thereby rendered to authority and law was such as to bring these essentials to civilized government into great contempt.⁵⁷ It is a remarkable tribute to the instinctive conservatism and the admirable steadiness of character in the transplanted Englishman, that Massachusetts, without a settled constitution, and depending solely on temporary regulations and the good behaviour of her citizens, had been able to provide for public order and private right, while engaged in a prolonged and almost desperate war.⁵⁸ To a degree

(54) Appendix B.

(55) *Ibid.*

(56) With the overthrow of the conservatives and of British authority, courts and government, the people, especially in the western half of Massachusetts, had been a law unto themselves. When finally, the Constitution of 1780 went into effect, the people were more or less disposed to flout authority. Wells: Adams, III:159-160, 162; Ind. Ch., May 23, Aug. 29, 1782; Diary of Wm. Pynchon, p. 127. The towns assumed an independent air toward the state government. See Dalton's vote of "Nullification" in 1786. Holland: Hist. of Western Mass., II:481. Likewise Dalton's act of "Secession," Dec. 27th, 1787. *Ibid.*, II:481-2. The Salem Gazette for May 2, 1782, has the resolution of a County Convention of 26 towns at Worcester, April 9th, 1782. In *ibid.*, for July 4, 1782, is the action of the Salem town meeting along similar lines.

(57) Cushing: Columbia Studies. VII: No. 1; pp. 88-90.

(58) Amid all this opposition to government and treason there were remarkably few lawless proceedings. Gen. Shepherd of Westfield had his horse treated infamously to be sure and when his barn was burnt the insurgents were accused of perpetrating that outrage. The worst bit of plundering was done by the government troops in Pelham. The rebels themselves treated their uprising in the lightest manner. M. North to Knox, Springfield, Feb. 19, 1787. Knox MSS. XVIII:138: "I saw about forty of those fellows, who had just been taken & were marching under guard to Pittsfield, they looked, & spoke very impudently to every one, who they supposed was on the other side, they halted a moment & when the line of march was again taken up, they went off skipping & jumping . . ." And they knew that they had been officially declared rebels by the reluctant legislature. Jackson to Knox, Boston, Feb. 3, 1787. Knox MSS. XIX:152: The rebels "have no idea of fighting, unless they are pushed to it—their only cry is mercy, mercy—they are much afraid of the Military, but expect to be fully heard & their petitions granted by the General Court."

Shays' Rebellion itself exemplifies this trait of the people.⁵⁹

(59) Notwithstanding the quick collapse of the movement there had been a great deal of alarm excited. Parsons, S. H. to Knox, Middletown, [Conn.] Nov. 6, 1786. Knox MSS. XIX:15: "I am informed some Towns have met in consequence of the Letter [of Shays] & have order[ed] the . . . arms & military Stores . . . to be delivered to the Insurgents [who are] daily practicing in military manœuvres & . . . [are] paid 3s in Cash each Day . . . if this is true . . . the fire is kindled from Causes we are not fully informed of—The flame has caught in Vermont" Knox to Parsons, New York, Nov. 19, 1786. Knox MSS. XIX:21: "Lord Dorchester has arrived in Canada. We must narrowly attend his motives. If he shall intrigue with Vermont, or the insurgents or both, it is probable that vast events are in the Moment of their birth." A year after the Rebellion was crushed, Knox writes to Col. Carrington, Feb. 14, 1788. Knox MSS. XXI:145: "yet 8/10ths of them [antifederalists] were paper money and tender law people and insurgents who are under the influence of people hoping for a reunion with Great Britain." The belief that the "Tories" were active in this uprising was widespread. See King's communication to the Massachusetts legislature, quoted in the Am. Herald, Oct. 16, 1786. Other assertions of this fact are to be found in *ibid*; Oct. 30, 1786; Mass. Gazette, Nov. 3, 14, Dec. 26, 1786.

CHAPTER IV.

THE ADOPTION OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION IN MASSACHUSETTS.

Massachusetts, the rival of Virginia and the leader of the New England group, was exceedingly jealous of her rights and virtual independence. In addition to the general desire for a strong government, unselfish and otherwise, prevalent among the wise and farseeing, two events contributed to a sharp lesson of humiliation through danger and adversity. One was the sorrowful result to the remnant of her commerce in the attempt to tax heavily British vessels.¹ This disaster was not forgotten by the chastened and humbled merchants, and the memory of it bore later much good fruit. The other was that widespread and threatening movement known as Shays' Rebellion which fully opened the eyes of all true patriots to their country's danger.²

Heretofore the demands of those who desired that more power should be conferred upon Congress had

(1) King: King, I:14-15, foot notes. Also S. Shaw to Knox, Boston, Aug. 8, 1785: "Our navigation act took place on the first instant. British bottoms have since sailed in ballast, carrying away money which they could not be allowed to Exchange for fish and lumber . . . If Congress had powers; now would be the time for them to show their wisdom in a vigorous exercise of them." Knox Mss. XVIII:67. See also Centinel, June 2, 9, 1790; Dec. 11, 1793.

(2) S. Breck to Knox, Boston, July 14, 1787. Knox MSS. XX:131: "The danger to which this Commonwealth has been exposed & the Villanous conduct of the State of Rhode Island will shew the necessity of parting with a greater Share of the Privileges to secure the remainder than we have been willing to do at any former Period—" North to Knox, Boston, Oct. 29, 1786. Knox MSS. XIX:36: "The people here, smell a rat, that the Troops about to be raised are more for the Insurgents than the Indians, however this makes no odds, every body seems to wish a strong Government . . ." Wadsworth to Knox, Hartford, Sept. 23, 1787. Knox MSS. XXI:13: "there is a strong party forming against the Convention and much reason to fear the new government will not go down—if the Massachusetts rebellion had continued we might have—" "In investigating the causes which gave life to the happy form of government which we shall ere long be under, the Historian will not forget the era of the late insurrections in this Commonwealth. The insurrections and the speedy quelling of them, must be considered as the causes of bringing in existence, at a much earlier period than would otherwise have been [the Federal] government . . ." Centinel, July 12, 1788. "Capt. Daniel Shays who a few years

been like voices crying in the wilderness.³ But it was this outbreak, which not only convinced men, but gave the great opportunity to those who had been earnestly longing for an adequate government.⁴ The party of Bowdoin comprised all those who were opposed to the "excess of democracy," which was rendering the Federal as well as the Massachusetts government incapable of commanding the respect and obedience of its citizens.

since commanded the body of Insurgents which shook this Commonwealth to its centre—and whose proceedings had great effect in producing our National Government is now confined in prison at Worcester, for debt." Centinel, June 20, 1792. Knox (writing to S. Higginson, Feb. 25, 1787, Knox MSS. XIX:179) presents another side to the conclusions which will be drawn from Shays' Rebellion: "The strongest arguments possible may be drawn from the events which have happened in that state . . . to effect a strong general government. But the rebellion has not had, and probably will not have, the effect, that one . . . would suppose—Although all the states, possess the fear of dissolution, which are hourly springing up . . . and in some States are nearly ripe . . . many people speak of the disorder of Massachusetts as produced by local causes . . . [which] will prevent those measures necessary to the establishment of [government] . . ." Yet he writes to Washington three months earlier, Dec. 21, 1786: "The commotions of Massachusetts have wrought prodigious changes in the minds of men in that State respecting the Powers of Government every body says they must be strengthened and that unless this be effected, there is no security for liberty or property." The most interesting contribution to the effects of Shays' Rebellion was the speech of Jonathan Smith of Lanesborough, Berkshire County, in the Massachusetts Convention. And his knowledge of the dangerous and anarchical conditions which existed in those turbulent times was at first hand, since Berkshire county felt the evil effects months after open disaffection had been stamped out in the other counties. His speech—for he was a farmer and therefore not open to the suspicion of aristocracy—could not but have had a very convincing effect on his "brother plough-joggers," as he called them. Debates . . . in the Convention . . . of Mass., p. 203. The following is from a speech made in the General Court, June 12, 1787: "We have letters from several gentlemen of character, a petition from a number of inhabitants . . . [which] testify [to] their danger; and that they are obliged to quit their habitations, and repair within the guards of safety during the night. Painting themselves like savages, they [the Insurgents] now take to the woods, are continually firing upon the guards, and peaceable citizens," Mass. Gazette, June 15, 1787. This is in Berkshire county.

(3) Salem Gazette, Feb. 20, 1783. The failure of Massachusetts' effort to conserve her small trade had been nullified by the opening of the Connecticut seaports to British trade. This increased the feeble demand for more federal power. Am. Herald, Feb. 28, April 25, 1785; Centinel, April 20, 1785. In the Independent Chronicle of March 10th, quoted in the Salem Gazette of June 7th, 1785, there is an interesting anticipation of Governor Bowdoin's famous address to the legislature on May 31st of this same year: "As to this state, if the private affairs of the members of the General Assembly now sitting will not admit of a longer session, the Court might appoint and empower a committee to address Congress, and the rest of the States, on the subject of our common necessities, and to consult on some measures of national benefit."

(4) See three letters of Higginson to Knox, Boston, Nov. 12, 25, 1786; Jan. 20, 1787, which illustrate clearly his conviction that "The present moment is very favorable to the forming further and necessary arrangements, for increasing the dignity & energy of Government . . ." Am. Hist. Assn. Rep. I (1896) 741-5. See also Knox to Washington, N. Y., Dec. 21, 1786. Ibid, p. 98; Washington to Lafayette, March 25, 1787. Sparks: Writings of Washington, IX:241-2. In the summer of 1787 there was stolen from S. Higginson and printed a letter, which made a tremendous commotion. It was evidently written to General

It was this conservative minority⁵ which worked unceasingly to carry the adoption of the constitution in Massachusetts,⁶ that state, whose intrinsic importance and weight was second to none and only equalled by Virginia, and on whose action probably depended the fate of the United States.⁷ So far as numbers went, the hostile elements were more numerous. These comprised Hancock and some of his party, whose great objection, it was charged, arose from the conviction that their honors and dignity would be materially lessened by the adoption.⁸

Lincoln in January while the latter was on his expedition to subdue Shays. It contained certain ambiguous terms which evidently refer to his and his friends' desire for a strong government: "From our last advices I have some hope you may get Shays in your power, this would finish the business to our wishes. We are here, preparing for matters more HARD TO MANAGE and MORE DANGEROUS than Shays and his party. But if you can give a decisive stroke to the latter, . . . we can more easily obtain the former. We are not here much less active in pursuing the GREAT OBJECT than you are..." Centinel, Aug. 1, 1787, from the Independent Chronicle. See also Centinel, Aug. 4, 8, 11, 15, 18, 22; Sept. 1; Mass. Gazette, Aug. 10, 1787; also *ibid.*, Dec. 3, 1788.

(5) There were even those who were for a monarchy. Knox to Washington, New York, Jan. 14, 1788. Drake: Memorial of the Cincinnati, pp. 180-2; N. Dane to Knox, Beverly, Dec. 27, 1787. Essex Inst. Hist. Coll. XXXV:89; Col. B. Tupper to Knox, April 1787. Knox MSS. XX:67: "Perhaps your Honor may remember that on my return from the Ohio I declared in favour of Majesty for which your Honor gave me a gentle check . . . I cannot give up the Idea that Monarchy in our present situation is become absolutely necessary to save the States from sinking into the lowest abyss of Misery. I have delivered my sentiments in all companies at this term, without reserve, and was, and am exceedingly pleased to find such a respectable number of my sentiments. I am clearly of Opinion if matters were properly arranged it would be easily and soon effected. The Old society of Cincinnati must once more consult and effect the Salvation of a distracted Country. While I remain in the Country [until removing to Ohio] I shall be a strong advocate for what I have suggested . . ."

(6) The whole management of the Constitution in the Convention was committed into the hands of a secret caucus of the leading federalists. T. Dalton to — [Boston], Feb. 3, 1788. Essex Inst. Hist. Coll. XXXV:87-8. Same to M. Hodge, [Boston], Jan. 30, 1788: "All this [that both Hancock and Adams will support the Constitution] is scarcely known out of our caucus, wherein we work as hard as in Convention." Same to S. Hooper, [Boston], Jan. 31, 1788: "Just returned from Caucus . . . We are not idle by Night or Day . . ." *Ibid.*, p. 94.

(7) E. Carrington to Knox, Richmond, Va., March 13, 1787. Knox MSS. XXI:167: "The decision of Massachusetts is perhaps the most important event that ever took place in America, as upon her in all probability depended the fate of the Constitution—had she rejected I am sure there would not have been the most remote chance for its adoption in Virginia . . ." Wadsworth to Knox, Hartford, Sept. 23, 1787, *ibid.*, XXI:13: "but if Massachusetts adopt it I shall still hope for the adoption here [in Connecticut] . . ." See also Drake: Life of Knox, p. 150; Debates . . . in the Convention . . . of Mass., p. 410; J. Langdon to Washington, Portsmouth, N. H., Feb. 28, 1788. Sparks: Correspondence of the Revolution, IV:211; Knox to —, New York (?), Jan. 3, 1788. Knox MSS. XXI:125: "everything depends on Massachusetts should she set the bright example . . ."

(8) Amory in his Life of Sullivan, I:224, tries to disprove this accusation.

Samuel Adams' opposition was a matter of principle.⁹ There can be no doubt that he honestly believed the liberties of the people and democracy itself were bottomed on the sovereignty of the states, and he clearly perceived that the Constitution was national rather than federal in many respects.¹⁰ Another important antagonist was Elbridge Gerry, one of the delegates to the Philadelphia Convention, who, after participating in the debates and making useful suggestions, had found that his conscience would not permit him to sign an instrument, which was, to him, dangerous in its tendencies and subversive of free government.¹¹

To these respectable opponents must be added factions whose opposition was based on either small or personal reasons. In Maine one part of the anti-federalists represented the so-called "Kennebec Squatters," who feared that somehow Federal Government would aid in dispossessing them of their

(9) Not only was the weight of Samuel Adams' influence thrown at first against the adoption of the Constitution in Massachusetts, but he opposed the calling of a convention in 1785. S. Adams to Gerry, Sept. 19, 1785: "A general Revision of the Confederation appears to me to be a dangerous Measure to be adopted at this Time." Gerry replies to Adams, Sept. 30, 1785: "I am happy to find that we unite in Sentiment . . . in opposing a general Revision of the Confederation." Both, however, were convinced that it was necessary to invest Congress with sufficient power for regulating foreign commerce. Adams insisted that "this Power [must be] properly guarded" and Gerry was determined to make this power merely "temporary." S. Adams MSS., N. Y. Public Library.

(10) S. Adams to R. H. Lee, Dec. 3, 1787: "I confess when [word illegible] Building, I stumble at the Threshold. I meet with a National Government instead of a federal Union of Sovereign States." S. Adams MSS., N. Y. Public Library. C. Gore to King, Dec. 23, 1787. King: King, I:265; Same to same, Dec. 30, 1787: "S. Adams is out full against it [Constitution]. There is ev'ry reason to conclude him the author of Helvidius Priscus . . ." Ibid, pp. 266-7; see N. Gorham to Knox, Jan. 6, 1788. Essex Inst. Hist. Coll. XXXV:89. An extract of a letter from Cambridge may throw some light. "Mr. A— had been very much upon the reserve as to his sentiments upon the new plan, till the choice of delegates for convention was made; and since that time has dipped his pen in venom and gall against the constitution . . . he [has] . . . encourag[ed] . . . the republication of Richard H. Lee's hacknied trumpery, in a pamphlet, circulated in Connecticut, and lately brought here . . ." Mass. Gazette, Jan. 1, 1788. N. Gorham to Knox, Charlestown, Feb. 18, 1787. Knox MSS. XIX:172: "Mr. Adams is full of doubts and difficulties & finding that he cannot obstruct the report generally wishes to limit the Commission in such manner as I think will exceedingly injure the business . . ." This was the report of the Annapolis Convention before the Massachusetts General Court in pursuance of a motion by Gerry. King: King, I:200.

(11) Gerry to the Senate and House of Representatives of Massachusetts. New York, Oct. 18, 1787. Austin: Gerry, II:42-5.

illegal land holdings.¹² Another portion was composed of those who were desirous of a separation from Massachusetts and who believed that their design would be hindered if not frustrated by the adoption of the Constitution.¹³

In Massachusetts proper the great bulk of antifederalism was denounced by conservatives as Shays' party.¹⁴ While in the Convention itself there were not a few of those who had participated in the armed uprising, this term of reproach covered all the various phases of radicalism and democracy which flourished during this period. As we have seen, what is termed Shays' Rebellion does not merely include lawless and armed attacks on the courts, which, arising first from anger and sense of injury, were afterwards necessary to prevent indictments by higher courts, but was the result of a large undirected movement of democracy, which aimed at leveling of distinctions in society, and also threatened stability of property under guise of the Tender Acts and paper money.¹⁵ The leaders of this party in the Convention were without any special talent and, what was prized most highly in those days, respectability. They were men, most of whom were obscure then, and all of whom are absolutely forgotten now.¹⁶ In this Convention the ability of the state

(12) *Mass Gazette*, Feb. 19, 1788. Extract of a letter from Portland; see also *Madison to Washington*, New York, Feb. 3, 1788. *Sparks: Correspondence of the Revolution*, IV:207.

(13) *Ibid.*, also C. Gore to King, Boston, Jan. 6, 1788. King to King, I:312.

(14) *Centinel*, Jan. 2, 1788, from the *Conn. Courant*. Knox's well known letter to Washington on Oct. 23, 1786, is in Brooks: *Knox*, pp. 194-6; see also Parsons: *Parsons*, pp. 63-4; *Madison to Washington*, Jan. 20, 1788. *Ibid.*, p. 60; same to same, Feb. 3, 1788. *Ibid.*, pp. 62-3.

(15) All attempts to induce Massachusetts to issue paper money failed, although individuals and towns clamored for it. *Mass. Gazette*, June 12, July 3, 1786; *Continental Journal*, Oct. 13, 1785; *Centinel*, Sept. 21, 1785, from the *Mass. Spy*. In 1786, the petition of the Bristol County Convention for paper money was rejected by the legislature 99 to 19. *Minot*, p. 31. In the legislature of the next year, which was supposed to be seriously infected with the views of Shayism, the proposal was even more emphatically frowned upon. J. Q. Adams to J. Adams, June 30, 1787. *Adams: Life in a N. E. Town*, pp. 119-120, foot note.

(16) Harding: *Federal Constitution in Mass.*, pp. 63-6, gives a brief biography of the leading antifederalists in the Convention. Gerry, Warren and Adams were either absent or largely silent in the Convention.

was enrolled almost exclusively on the side of the federalists.¹⁷

The commercial elements especially were eagerly awaiting results of the labors of the Constitutional Convention.¹⁸ Judging the rest of the state by their interest and anticipations, these partial observers were convinced of the prompt and easy adoption of that instrument which it was deemed would bring prosperity to their undertakings.¹⁹ "The people of Boston," wrote Knox, "are in raptures with it as it is, but would have liked it still better had it been higher-toned."²⁰ The publication of the text of the Constitution in the Centinel on September 26th, was followed soon after by the first open attack against that document²¹ by a person who preferred to remain unknown and to escape the "treatment . . . so liberally bestowed on Mr. Gerry . . . and other most respectable

(17) The overwhelming odds in favor of the federalists so far as talents and "respectability" went are strikingly brought out in a letter from a member of the Convention, quoted by Madison to Washington, Feb. 3, 1788. Sparks: Correspondence of the Revolution, IV:207-8. B. Bidwell to D. Daggett, Tyringham, June 16, 1787: "Debtors are generally on the other side; and this comprehends more than half of the people. Persons guilty of crimes, or who wish to commit crimes; Rhode Island Emigrants, and almost all of the denomination of Baptists and boys . . . such have pretty generally engaged in the Insurrection." Proc. Am. Antiq. Soc. N. S. IV (1885-7) 369. Also Knox to Washington, New York, Oct. 23, 1786. Brooks: Knox, pp. 194-5.

(18) Knox to Washington, New York, Aug. 14, 1787. Sparks: Correspondence of the Revolution, IV:178.

(19) J. Sullivan to King, Boston, Sept. 23, 1787. King: King, I:259: "Our people expect so much happiness from the doings of the Convention that they stand ready to adopt anything . . . it will meet with no opposition in this state." C. Gore to King, Oct. 7, 1787, *ibid.*, p. 261. The legislature made provision for the calling of the state convention by a vote of 129 in a total of 161. This majority was made possible by the amendment that the delegates be paid by the state treasurer, not by the respective towns. Jackson to Knox, Boston, Oct. 21, 1787. Knox MSS. XXI:23; N. Gorham to Knox, Boston, Oct. 25, 1787, *ibid.*, XXI:28. Jackson to Knox, Boston, Oct. 28, 1787, *ibid.*, XXI:29: "from the present disposition of the people there is not the least doubt but the New Constitution will be accepted . . . by a very large Majority . . ." King to Knox, Boston, Oct. 28, 1787, *ibid.*, XXI:30. "I am laboring . . . I doubt not that others labor against me, but I cannot discover any person of consequence in this quarter who stands wrong—last Evening I spent in preaching on the Report of the Convention to the Representatives of Main[e], they had received some ill impressions . . . Cushing the Chief Justice gave a solemn charge last week in Bristol to the Grand Jury, enlarged upon our distressed situation . . . and concluded in favor of the adoption of the [constitution] . . . this charge will be repeated at Cambridge . . ."

(20) To Washington, New York, Aug. 14, 1787. Sparks: Correspondence of the Revolution, IV:178.

(21) Dr. Harding (in his *Federal Constitution in Massachusetts*, p. 20) makes this statement, with which the writer's researches agree. The article is in the *Mass. Gazette* for Oct. 9, 1787.

characters, who appear to have objected to the plan of confederation...'²² This unanimity once broken, others followed this hardy individual who raised doubts regarding the perfection and even the desirability of the proposed Constitution.²³ Judging from the excitement and anger aroused, Gerry's hostile attitude and his letter caused the most harm to the federalists.²⁴ Still Gorham wrote to Knox on October 30th: "Things look pretty well though there is an opposition preparing, but I do not think it will be sufficient [to answer] . . . the intentions of some. . . ."²⁵

As November passed, the opposition grew. A handbill containing a number of articles depicting the miserable condition of Boston should the Constitution be adopted, was posted up in that city.²⁶

(22) *Ibid.*, Oct. 16, 1787. The editor of the paper had to issue a reassuring statement as to the motives of this assailer of the Constitution and to decline to reveal the name of the author despite the many demands. In *ibid.* (for Oct. 13) there is a stricture on the article against the Constitution.

(23) Harding: Federal Constitution in Mass. Chap. II, *passim*.

(24) Mass. Gazette, Oct. 12, 1787; Centinel, Nov. 10, 14, 1787. In the latter it is admitted that Gerry's opposition is of great weight with doubters and others. The letter itself appeared in the Centinel of Nov. 3d, 1787. It was the well known letter of Oct. 18th which was addressed to the legislature of the state explaining his reasons for not signing the document. As this was wholly a gratuitous performance, its animus and purpose were self-revealed. Jackson to Knox, Boston, Nov. 11, 1787. Knox MSS. XXI:47: "Mr. Gerrys letter has done much mischief in this State...it has given great strength to the small, **very** small party that were in the opposition...his friends and Circle...are exceedingly displeased... However the **System** stands firm & well as yet, and have no doubt but it will be finally adopted in this State..." Same to same, Nov. 18, 1787, *ibid.*, XXI:51: It "has done great injury...more than he will ever be able to do good by a whole life of repentance—everything went on firm and well until that dam'd letter...the Insurgent interest is the only influence against it [the Constitution]—but this is pretty powerful." Also C. Gore to King, Dec. 30, 1787. King: King, I:267; N. Gorham to Knox, Charlestown, Dec. 4, 1787. Knox MSS. XXI:66: "Mr. Gerry's letter has done infinite mischief...Dr. Franklin favored me with some observations he made just before he put his name to the Constitution—I have had it published—it has had a wonderful effect." (Printed in *Debates...in the Convention...of Mass.*, pp. 352-4). A most bitter attack was made upon Gerry by Oliver Ellsworth for his letter and his attitude. It begins: "In Massachusetts the opposition began with you, and from motives most pitifully selfish and despicable; you addressed yourself to the Shays faction, and that faction will be your only support." [This prophecy in regard to his political support was abundantly justified by subsequent events.] Centinel, Jan. 2, 5, from the Conn. Courant. Also in Ford: *Essays on the Constitution, 1787-8*. T. Dalton to —, Jan. 20, 1787. Essex Inst. Hist. Coll. XXV:19: "If [the Constitution]... be rejected we must thank Mr. Gerry."

(25) Knox MSS. XXI:35.

(26) Am. Herald, Nov. 19, 1787. Reprinted in that issue. It asserted the trade of Boston would be driven to Philadelphia and the rich men would leave Boston for that place; hence the tradesmen would starve and Boston's importance would be annihilated; liberty of the press restrained; trial by jury and writ of habeas corpus abolished; loss of liberty result and consequent loss of virtue

Although the greater part of the activity of the federalists was done by personal missionary work with individuals, the channels of the newspapers were not neglected. Lively resentment was shown by the outraged friends of the Constitution. Exclaimed one indignant correspondent "A late writer, who signs [himself] *Old Whig*, begins his strictures upon the Constitution by applying the polite and liberal epithet of CUNNING to the members of Convention...What? the GREAT WASHINGTON and his associates in Convention, descend to *cunning* and artifice?"²¹ Another ascribed the whole opposition to "originate from the officers of government, who are afraid of losing their salaries or places."²² When December came and the election returns began to drift in, the error of their previous optimism was perfectly apparent. On the coast things looked favorable in general, even Bristol county, "which was supposed to be wrong, is by a great majority right."²³ However, no false hopes were entertained in regard to the opposition from

in the people who would become "vicious, indolent and dissolute"; discouragement of agriculture; a standing army, and a navy "calculated to give genteel Employment to the idle and extravagant;" a "Multiplicity of offices to provide for ruined Fortunes; and finally Representatives chosen in such a way as to make it a Business of Life." This was argument *ad hominem*, and quite different from the lofty and more or less abstract discussion of principles which characterized the antifederalist campaign to a certain extent. The "Indignant reception" which this "inflammatory document" met with is given in the *Centinel* for Nov. 21, 1787. But in the same issue is a list of twenty-three objections to the Constitution, and in nautical language the antifederal activity is outlined in *ibid* for Nov. 24, 1787.

A very fair objection to the dictatorial and hasty methods of the federalists is made in the *American Herald* for Dec. 17, 1787: "It would have been very extraordinary that [this]...System of National Government...should have been less examined than a Bye-Law made by a town-meeting—and yet if the pretended friends of the People could have had their way...this...would have been the case." R. H. Lee writes to S. Adams, New York, Oct. 5, 1787: "The friends of just Liberty are astonished at the Occlusions of Press in Boston." S. Adams MSS., N. Y. Public Library. See the denials of this fact by the printers in the *Centinel*, Oct. 27, 1787.

(27) *Ibid*, Oct. 31, 1787. There are two other broadsides directed against the offending "Old Whig" in this issue alone. In the same issue is a dialogue between "Mr. Z. and Mr. Antifederalist."

(28) *Ibid*, Oct. 27, 1787. The piece continues: "remember the opposition which our Independence received from a few officers of government in the years 1775 and 1776. Recollect the Friendly addresses and the Catos, which appeared...these publications, came from men of greater understanding, and more extensive influence than Randolph, Mason or Gerry."

(29) King: King, I:264.

the interior; "a black cloud will come down from the three Western Counties,"³⁰ "the delegates from Worcester county will generally oppose."³¹

The attitude of the delegates from Maine was equally bad.³² How the hopes and the fears alternated can be gathered from a letter of Dana's to Knox, "ten days ago the friends of the Constitution thought there was no chance of the adoption, but... now... there is nearly an equal chance in its favor." But he adds on visiting Boston, December 30th, "Since I arrived I find the elections in the province of Main[e] and in the three Western counties have not been so much in favor of the Constitution as was supposed."³³

With the assembling of the convention it became perfectly apparent that the weight of numbers was decidedly in favor of the anti-federalists.³⁴ The leaders of the latter party were likewise convinced of that fact, but attempting to hurry the decision were decisively defeated.³⁵ Solicitous to add to their strength, Samuel Adams moved that Mr. Gerry be given a seat on the Convention floor, adding suggestively, that he "might elucidate the Business by

(30) *Ibid.*, p. 263.

(31) *Ibid.* Also N. Dane to Knox, Beverly, Dec. 27, 1787. Knox MSS. XXI:28.

(32) N. Gorham to King, Charlestown, Dec. 29, 1787. King: King, I:266: "Most of the Eastern Members are wrong."

(33) Knox MSS. XXI:28. Gorham writes earlier: "The prospect rather brightens here...there is a hundred good Men chosen in this neighborhood & the other parts of the Sea Coast...a great number of Towns chuse tomorrow...[of these] we may count on 50 members of the right sort—that added to the former—with a few good ones that will come from the Western Counties—I think will secure the Point"—and ends with a frantic appeal to Rufus King to be present. Others wrote the same to Knox, Charlestown, Dec. 16, 1787. Knox MSS. XXI:73. For their joy on King's arrival see T. Parsons to Hodge, Boston, Jan. 14, 1788. Essex Inst. Hist. Coll. XXXV:93; also Gorham to Knox, Jan. 30, 1788. *Ibid.*, 94.

(34) N. Gorham to Knox, Boston, Jan. 16, 1788. Knox MSS. XXI:110: "the prospects not very good—numbers are at present against us—and the opposition leaders say they are sure of the Victory—if they succeed in opposition to such a phalanx of sensible Men & good Speakers as are in this Assembly it will be very extraordinary—we know all is at stake & work accordingly..." Knox to Washington, Feb. 10, 1788: "It is now no secret that, on the opening of the Convention, a majority were prejudiced against it." Debates...in the Convention...of Mass., p. 410.

(35) Samuel Adams made a notable speech against this proposal and his opposition doubtless made the majority so decisive. *Ibid.*, pp. 72-5. B. Lincoln to Washington, Jan. 27, 1788. Sparks: Correspondence of the Revolution, IV:204.

Information, &c., that possibly had Escaped the Memory of the other Gentlemen of the General Convention."³⁶ Fearful that the rejection of the proposal would stir up jealousy and in order to avoid developing the full strength of the opposition thus early, the federalists made no serious objection.³⁷ The next day Gerry's attempt "unasked" to proffer some information led to friction.³⁸ Subsequently he withdrew without having caused damage to the cause of the Constitution.³⁹

As the debates went on from day to day, the leaders of the opposition were dismayed to find that the telling arguments were having considerable effect and that their majority was dwindling.⁴⁰ To remedy this situation they tried to effect "an adjournment in Order to influence the Country at large against the Constitution.}" The federalists, fully aware that it would be "a total destruction of it" defeated the proposal.⁴¹ With all the specific objections which the anti-federalists brought up—biennial elections, powers of Congress and of taxation, Federal courts, slavery and the "three-fifths" representation—it was the deep suspicion of and hatred against the upper classes which underlay all the opposition.⁴² Amos Singletary voices it when he says,

(36) Maj. Sargent to Knox, Jan. 12, 1788. Knox MSS. XXI:103. This was an amendment to Widgery's motion seconded by Adams that the "Lt. Governor & Council should be complimented with Seats in the Convention..." Ibid.

(37) King to Madison, Boston, Jan. 16, 1787 [sic]. King: King, I:313. The same policy was continued until almost the final vote. Same to same, Boston, Jan. 27, 1788. Ibid, p. 317.

(38) Same to same. Jan. 20, 1788; *ibid*, pp. 314-5.

(39) The great fear of the federalists that Gerry would return and damage their cause is tacitly avowed by their references to him. King: King, I:318, 319; Lincoln to Washington, Boston, Feb. 3, 1788. Sparks: Correspondence of the Revolution, IV:206.

(40) As the federalists had a coterie of leaders who worked in season and out, so it seemed had the anti-federalists. In an attack upon General Warren during the gubernatorial campaign of the spring of 1788, a writer accuses him of being "busy in...opposition...his emissaries were constantly engaged in attending the nocturnal scenes of the star chamber, and manufacturing speeches for the anti-federal junto..." Mass. Gazette, March 7, 1788.

(41) Jackson to Knox, Boston, Jan. 23, 1788. Knox MSS. XXI:116.

(42) When John Quincy Adams could write the following in his diary, Oct. 12, 1787, it is not at all surprising that the people in general did hold such dark views of the aristocracy and of their intentions and should look upon the Constitution with great suspicion. "He [Theophilus Parsons] favors very much the

"they expect to get into Congress . . . to be the managers of this Constitution, and get all the power and all the money into their own hands, and then they will swallow up all us little folks, like the great leviathan..yes, just as the whale swallowed up Jonah."⁴³ This feeling crudely enough expressed in this speech, seems to have permeated the opposition. It was part and parcel of the strong democratic tide which came from the Revolution, and which received such a check from Shays' Rebellion. Rufus King in two letters to Madison finds in this strong passion of ill-will toward the rich and the gentry the root of all the trouble.⁴⁴ Others, who blindly denounced Shayism as the cause of the resistance, perceived the truth vaguely, although entirely unable to analyze the factors in the situation.

It became evident to the federalist managers that it was impossible to ratify the Constitution as it stood.⁴⁵ They then took up reluctantly the proposition of amendments "not as a condition of our assent & ratification, but as the opinion of the Convention, subjoined to their ratification" since it was necessary to adopt some expedient as "our prospects are gloomy, but hope is not entirely extinguished."⁴⁶

Evidently the scheme to induce Hancock to appear in favor of the Constitution by means of the "conciliatory propositions" was hatched between this date

Federal Constitution... Nor do I wonder at all...as it is calculated to increase the influence, power and wealth of those who have any influence. If the Constitution be adopted it will be a grand point in favor of the aristocratic party. There are to be no titles of nobility; but there will be great distinctions, and those distinctions will soon be hereditary, and we shall consequently have nobles, but no titles...it is hard to give up a system which I have always been taught to cherish, and to confess that a free government is inconsistent with human nature." Adams: *Life in a N. E. Town*, p. 46.

(43) *Debates...in the Convention...of Mass.*, p. 203.

(44) Boston, Jan. 27, 1788. King: King, I:316-7; Jan. 30, 1788. Ibid, I:317-8.

(45) King to Madison, Jan. 27, 1788. King: King, I:317: "by the last calculation...we were doubtful whether we exceeded them, or they us. They...[assert] a majority of eight or twelve." See also *Essex Inst. Hist. Coll.* XXXV:93.

(46) King to Madison, Jan. 23, 1788. King: King, I:116. He adds: "This scheme may gain us a few members, but the issue is doubtful."

and January 27th, for King writes: "Our hopes do not diminish, although our confidence is not complete. The opposition are less positive of their strength."⁴⁷ Their apprehensions were well founded. Besides the talk of amendments there were "those Few among them [the anti-federalists] who are honest & capable of Reflection [and] appear uneasy concerning the Fate of the Question," who seemed to be wavering. But in addition, the meeting of the Boston mechanics⁴⁸ designedly called together to bring pressure to bear on the members of the Convention from Boston, especially on Samuel Adams, was effectual among other factors in silencing them, and obtaining their votes in favor.⁴⁹ It was the appearance of Hancock, armed with the "Parsons amendments,"⁵⁰ to take his tardy seat as President of the Convention which made the final conversions⁵¹

(47) King to Knox, Boston, Jan. 27, 1788. Knox MSS. XXI:121: "yesterday's Centinel contains a proposal for a conditional Ratification, said to have come from Sullivan, the Opposition give it some Countenance,—[it] show[s] that our Opponents are not so confident of their Numbers, since hitherto they have reprobated the Suggestion of amendments and insisted among their Party on a total Rejection of the Constitution." A significant letter was written by King to Madison, Jan. 30, 1788: "This day...Mr. Hancock, took his seat in the Convention... I cannot predict the issue, but our hopes are increasing. If Mr. Hancock does not disappoint our present expectations, our wishes will be gratified, but his character is not entirely free from a portion of caprice. This however is confidential." King: King, I:317-8.

(48) The meeting was on January 7th. 300 strong the tradesmen came together and adopted five resolutions in favor of the Constitution. *Mass. Gazette*, Jan. 8, 1788. See also Quincy: *Life of Josiah Quincy*, p. 416.

(49) C. Gore to King, Boston, Jan. 6, 1788. King: King, I:311-2, "a meeting [of the tradesmen is] to be held tomorrow night...this may possibly have effect on Mr. A[dams] if not—it will effect his E[xcellency, i. e., Hancock] who wavers...& one other who is greatly influence'd by A[dams]...[this is probably Dr. Jarvis]. Mr. A[dams] unless affected by some such step as these, will be indefatigable & constant in all ways & means to defeat the adoption..." As a matter of fact Adams' open opposition seems to have subsided, and whereas he had been actively engaged against the Constitution what few movements he made in the convention were in favor of the federalists. Jackson to Knox, Boston, Jan., 1788. Knox MSS. XXI:113: "Mr. S. Adams has not yet come out, if he is against it I believe he will say but little, as the meeting of the mechanics of this Town & their proceedings must and will have an influence over him..."

(50) Evidence points to Theophilus Parsons as the author. Whoever the author, no one contends that Hancock had anything to do with them except to present them. Knox to C. Livingston, N. Y., Feb. 10, 1788, Knox MSS. XXI:140: "On Thursday he [Hancock] brought forward the motion for adopting the Constitution and for recommending certain alterations... As the motion and recommendations... were the mature production [underlined in the original letter] of the Federalists there cannot be a doubt of the committee reporting in favor of the ratification."

(51) While accusations of direct bribery and corruption have no foundation [Harding: *Federal Constitution in Mass.*, pp. 100-3], yet this letter is interesting as showing how influence may work indirectly with the doubtful: "the whole

necessary to carry the day. By a narrow majority, nineteen only, was Massachusetts induced to ratify the Constitution, the vote standing 187 to 168.⁵²

Thus it came about that in the face of great odds the federalist leaders won a hard fought battle against ignorance and prejudice, honest doubt and opposition. The credit for their triumph is to be attributed to their unwearied exertions to leave no stone unturned that could contribute to "the Cause." In the varied undertakings which brought them ultimate success the political tricks stand out most conspicuously in their campaign.⁵³ Nevertheless it was the clear reasoning, the unanswerable logic, the careful explanations, the courteous attention to objections, which the federalists statesmen and orators so abundantly displayed through those

race of the Antis are a set of poor devils...& it will be impossible for them to leave the Town, unless they receive their pay—they begin to be alarmed and talk of their Pay Roll, some of them have been to the Treasurer, he informs them he has not a dollar in the public chest—nor does he know where to borrow one—We have circulated,—if the Constitution is adopted, there will be no difficulty respecting the Pay—If it is not they must look to the Treasurer for it—' Jackson to Knox, Boston, Jan. 31, 1788. Knox MSS. XXI:131. [The lack of money in the Treasury had been, at least, an actual fact. The General Court had to use the credit of the doorkeeper at times to get wood to heat their halls. During Shays' Rebellion, a year before, as the Treasurer was empty, it was only by means of a public subscription that Gen. Lincoln was enabled to march to Springfield.] In two instances there are charges brought of using unusual if not improper methods to gain election. A friend of Kilham of Newburyport [see an attack upon him, and a promise of a coat of tar and feathers, for his anti-federal activities, in the Mass. Gazette, March 18, 1788], who was defeated, asked, among other insinuations: "Whether he [the successful candidate] went as a British Nobleman would have gone with the most persuasive arguments in his pockets." Am. Herald, Nov. 26, 1787. See also *ibid.*, Dec. 10, 1787.

(52) The careful count kept by the federalists is shown by the general belief (by Feb. 3rd) that they would be victorious. Freeman wrote to Knox that "it will pass with a small majority." Knox MSS. XXI:25. Jackson writes the same. *Ibid.*, XXI:131. Gorham is even more definite: "I think," he writes to Knox, "[it] will be about 185 for to 160 or a few more against it—" *Ibid.*, XXI:129. James Madison (to Washington, Feb. 3, 1788,) quotes a letter from a member of the convention, saying: "We may...get a majority of twelve or fifteen, if not more." Sparks: Correspondence of the Revolution, IV:207-8. See also Essex Inst. Hist. Coll. XXXV:93.

(53) To "accelerate" favorable opinions among the mechanics certain wealthy men subscribed for the building of three vessels in case the Constitution was adopted. After the victory the enthusiasm seems to have dwindled considerably for an "Observing Countryman," after calling attention to the above fact, complains: 'Did they suppose a fine vehement exclamation 'that the Constitution was equal to the mines of Peru' would feed and clothe...men...?' Centinel, March 15, 1788. Nevertheless the fact of the subscriptions is used as a federalist campaign document. *Ibid.*, March 29, 1788.

dark days of mid-winter, that brought them the well earned victory.⁵⁴

(54) The force of argument and brilliant oratory of the federalist leaders was well foreshadowed by Sedgwick's victory in the Stockbridge town meeting called to elect a delegate to the Constitutional Convention at Boston. He had to keep them there until 10 o'clock in the evening to persuade them of the desirability of that proposed plan of government. Then he was elected "by a great majority to represent that Town in the State Convention." Ibid, Dec. 15, 1787. A eulogy on his powers of persuasive oratory in the Convention is in *ibid*, Oct. 22, 1794.

CHAPTER V.

THE TRIUMPH OF HANCOCK, 1788 TO 1793.

The election of Bowdoin¹ for the year 1786-7 had been uncontested, for no one relished the unpleasant position of governor in view of the stormy times in prospect.² It was quite otherwise the next year, 1787, with the rebellion thoroughly crushed. The campaign was well under way in February,³ although the evident determination of the people to elect Hancock again, he being deemed less inflexible and more likely to deal leniently with the insurgents, manifested itself long before this.⁴ The very acts of the legislature deepened the growing purpose. On the one hand, they passed such a thorough-going disqualifying act that it was asserted to have disfranchised whole towns.⁵ Its severity was complained of by the staunchest supporters of government,⁶ while it was artfully asserted to be framed with a view

(1) See the Centinel, March 24, 1786.

(2) The only opposition discernable was that directed against the Lieutenant-governor Thomas Cushing. "Fabius" attacks him for having monopolized that office so long. Am. Herald, March 27, April 3, 1786. "Cato" replies in the latter issue. There seems to be some animus aroused against the legislature which "finding that a rotation in the public office, was likely to take place...they in pity to the folly and ignorance of the PEOPLE, caucus'd it by counties, and agreed who should be elected Lt. Governor the ensuing election." Am. Herald, March 27, 1786. "What," ejaculates a correspondent, "...are not our great folks...the fittest to determine who are the proper subjects for chairs in the next ensuing Election [for representatives]?" Ibid, April 17, 1786. See also another piece in *ibid*, March 27, 1786. The attitude toward the legislature is shown in the Mass. Gazette, June 19, 1786: "There were great changes...in the Representation...the firmness of the late House in rejecting the visionary schemes of...[Tender Acts, Paper Money, etc.] has stirred up the friends of the measures to very great exertions." Continental Journal, May 18, 1786.

(3) J. Swan to Knox, Dorchester, Feb. 25, 1787. Knox MSS. XX:2: "Hancock & Lincoln seem to be principally talk'd of. The reasons...were...both [were]...military men & altho' H. was not so much as L. yet both were more so than Bowdoin—That a change of men would probably bring about a change of measures—that money might be saved by it &c.—"

(4) Mass. Gazette, Jan. 9, 1787. Two months before this King writes (to D. Kilham, New York, Nov. 25, 1787) apprehensively: "How goes Electioneering? Men and measures are now very intimately united. Displace men and you disapprove measures." King: King, II:615.

(5) Lincoln to Knox, March 1, 1787. Knox MSS. XX:8.

(6) Even Higginson was moved to say: "the Legislature have behaved well and conducted with spirit—they have adopted an energetic system of policy with

to keeping Bowdoin and his friends in office.⁷ But it was the attempt of the legislature to reduce the governor's salary, exorbitant salaries being one of the many grievances of the malcontents, which roused the people more thoroughly against Bowdoin. No other act demonstrates his almost fanatical devotion to duty and principles better than the veto of this highly popular measure, for he realized that it meant inevitable retirement.⁸

Nevertheless strenuous exertions were made by the friends of the governor. Urgent appeals were extended repeatedly to all the "friends of the government" for support. In the event of Bowdoin's defeat they gloomily predicted that "in every probability" those "scenes of war" would recommence.⁹ At any rate it would mean that all the late measures of government would be overthrown;¹⁰ that the state constitution was in grave danger; and that "the eyes of the continent are upon us—the friends to government, peace and justice, in *Connecticut*, *New Hampshire* and *Rhode Island*, are waiting with an anxiety not to be described, the event of our decision—and so are the insurgents in all parts of the

respect to the rebels, perhaps in some instances they have carried their resentment too far." To N. Dane, Boston, March 3, 1787. *Am. Hist. Assn. Rep.* I (1896) 754. See also *Mass. Gazette*, March 20, 1787. The insurgents used this as a pretext for justifying their opposition, although "Almost all acknowledged that they took a wrong method..." B. Bidwell to D. Daggett, Tyringham, June 10, 1787. *Proc. Am. Antiq. Soc. N. S. IV* (1885-7) 369.

(7) J. Sullivan to King, Boston, Feb. 25, 1787. *King: King*, I:215.

(8) The message containing the veto is in the *Centinel*, March 14, 1787. In the course of which Bowdoin very plainly indicates his belief that he would probably be defeated at the coming election. "The salary...has...inflamed the popular odium against [Bowdoin]...and many...seem to view him as little better than a rapacious, unfeeling, and mighty Plunderer." *Mass. Gazette*, March 30, 1787, from the *Essex Journal*, March 28. In regard to this Gorham wrote to Knox (Charlestown, March 11, 1787): "one step they took which I am afraid will be injurious in the approaching election...the Governor supposed himself bound by every principle of honor & regard to the Constitution to send back the Bill with his objections...altho the[y]...are well done & in the most guarded manner...great use will be made of it against the Governor..." *Knox MSS. XX:18*. On June 21st Hancock announces to the General Court that he resigns £300 of his salary, though this is not to form any precedent. *Mass. Gazette*, June 26, 1787. In the same paper is a fulsome flattery of the act of "his excellency...as a friend to the people..."

(9) *Centinel*, March 28, 1787.

(10) *Ibid*, March 24, 1787.

union.”¹¹ Even such frantic appeals as these fell upon deaf ears; they were not at all convinced by such alarming addresses, or moved by the agitated feelings of neighbors.¹² As a last desperate attempt to influence the voters the Bowdoinites circulated a handbill addressed “to the Free, Virtuous and Independent Electors of Massachusetts” a few days before election. It was largely made up of severe strictures on Hancock, dealing plainly with his entire unfitness for the high position. Nor was this all, for it continues: “It is said, that a Committee from their [Insurgent] Body has waited upon Mr. H—— to request his acceptance of the chair, if their Influence could effect his choice to it, and also to know his Mind with respect to the Introduction of a Paper Currency: to both which Propositions he has given his Assent.”¹³ Such accusations added great bitterness to the closing days of the campaign without, it may be inferred from the returns, adding to Bowdoin’s vote. In truth it is not difficult to believe that it even reduced his far from numerous adherents.¹⁴ The election returns were so decisive¹⁵ that it would seem as if the desire of the large majority to make

(11) *Ibid.* March 31, 1787.

(12) Some individual thought to popularize Bowdoin by asserting that a governor “ought to be possessed of in an eminent degree [the art of]...FINANCIERING; for from an accomplished Financier we are to expect the greatest relief from the pressure of our foreign and domestic debts.” *Centinel*, March 26, 1787. As the generality of people at this time were engaged in dodging the payment of debts as well as taxes, Bowdoin’s proposals and attempts to lighten burdens by paying the state debt by collecting the back taxes—which Hancock’s easy-going regime had piled up enormously—and thus reducing both principal and interest, would scarcely appeal to them.

(13) See Appendix C.

(14) *Ibid.*

(15) Hancock got 18,459; Bowdoin, 6,394. The vote for Lieutenant-governor was very scattered. Out of a total of 21,844, Cushing, the present incumbent, received less than half, 10,107; Lincoln had 6,767; Heath, 1,423; Gorham, 1,608; S. Adams, 644. Before the day of election it was only too apparent how the tide was running. Wrote B. Hichborn to Knox, Boston(?), March 25, 1787, Knox MSS. XX:28: “Hancock will have 3/4 if not 4/5 of ye Votes next week to be Governor,—Lincoln & Bowdoin’s Friends have made a great mistake in dividing their force—Cushing will be Lieutenant...Lincoln is very popular but he with Bowdoin is damned by his Connection.” [In a bracket is the explanation, “Higginson & Co.”] Even before the result was self-evident. Jackson to Knox, March 18, 1787, Knox MSS. XX:24: “it is seriously...believed that Mr. H—— will be chosen—all the Western Counties to a Man is in his favor, and the County of Essex & Bristol...”

sure of the pardoning of the insurgents confined in jail and under sentence of death was the controlling factor. But the bitterness aroused in the early part of this decade, which also flared up so sharply in the election of 1785 was prolonged by continuous bickerings months after the election day in April.¹⁶ The Bowdoinites took their defeat ill and vented their wrath in various directions.¹⁷

It is a fair assumption that they sought to embarrass the new administration by violent demands that the rebels under sentence of death be executed forthwith.¹⁸ To arouse public opinion letters from the western counties were written detailing the disquietude of the friends of government, the continued outrages of the insurgents, and the insolent conduct and challenging boasts of the pardoned rebels.¹⁹ The friends of Hancock sought to crush this "small disappointed party," as the Bowdoinites were termed, by denouncing them as a "*set of insurgents...a formidable combination of aristocracy,*"²⁰

(16) These mutual accusations and counter accusations become excessively multiplied and heated because of that stolen letter of Stephen Higginson. Hardly an issue of the Centinel, the American Herald or the Massachusetts Gazette for August and September (1787), but is spiced by some crimination or retort. See especially Am. Herald, Aug. 6; Centinel, Aug. 11, 29, ("Cassius" in) Sept. 20, 28, Oct. 2; Mass. Gazette, Sept. 14.

(17) From the lists submitted by a statistician, Centinel, April 4, 1787, it would appear that most of the servants and laborers in Boston voted for Hancock. Some at least were discharged for it by their employers. Ibid, April 11, 1787. "I have been surprised at the continual abuse which is heaped upon [the] ...merchants, for [discharging men who voted for Hancock]..." Ibid, April 25, 1787. From western Massachusetts came an assertion that "None, in this part of the State, voted for any other candidate...than [Bowdoin]...but insurgents, and their abettors." Ibid, April 11, 1787. Letter from Springfield, dated April 6.

(18) James Sullivan in a letter to King (Amory: Sullivan, I:202-3) makes this assertion, roundly charging Theophilus Parsons with the origin of the plan "for the then Governor Bowdoin to leave the unhappy convicts in the hands of Hancock; and this was done to throw the odium of the execution upon him. Parsons says, unless the prisoners are now executed speedily, the commonwealth is undone; and brother Sedgwick, that the state must be saved by their fall, or fall by their liberation. Yet he petitioned and wrote, with...others, to the late governor in their favor, and absolutely declared, in his letters and petitions, that it will be for the public good to pardon Wilcox and Austin." Bowdoin's whole public and private course of life forbids this oblique insinuation of complicity in this cunning scheme. Warm a partisan as Sullivan is and given to misstatements and exaggerations, this letter contains too many direct statements to reject it entirely. Especially, as the letter (undated by Amory) is evidently a private communication as well as contemporary and he would hardly make these accusations out of whole cloth. See also Centinel, Sept. 1, 1787.

(19) See Appendix D.

(20) Centinel, May 12, 1787.

and as "overgrown rich..who feel the importance of..continuing the abominable system of enormous taxation which is crushing the poor to death . . . [who] are GREAT POSSESSORS of..publick securities..who have too long had the carving of the loaves and fishes."²¹ While these were mere electioneering articles during the campaign for representatives to the General Court—in which the friends of the debtor classes made strenuous exertions—yet this is the charge of aristocracy (at that time imputed to Bowdoin's friends) which came to be used so much, especially in the next decade.

The maneuvers of the closing days of the Constitutional Convention in Massachusetts, 1787-1788, determined the course of the spring gubernatorial election.²² The ratification at that assemblage turned on the amendments which were probably drawn up by a small committee of the federalists who induced Hancock to present them, in return, it is now believed, for support towards his presidential aspirations and to promote his election as governor that spring.²³ While these two parties were thus bound together by this community of interest the bond was loose enough to permit serious differences to arise concerning the lieutenant-governor.²⁴ As a result Lincoln and Adams divided the votes of the federalists of all descriptions, while the insurgent-anti-federal party exerted themselves in favor of General Warren.²⁵ The candidacy of this latter greatly

(21) *Ibid.* May 5, 1787.

(22) Hancock and Lincoln were unanimously nominated at a "respectable Caucus" undoubtedly held in Boston. Jackson to Knox, Boston, March 10, 1788. Knox MSS. XXI:165. On April 4th another meeting was held at Ipswich—apparently of Essex County gentlemen of influence—for there were present "20 justices, many member[s] of the grand jury, and petit jury of the county besides other respectable gentlemen"—and decided unanimously to support Hancock and Lincoln. *Centinel*, April 5, 1788. Letter from Ipswich dated April 4. Hancock and Adams were nominated at a caucus at Boston, March 23rd. *Ibid.* March 29, 1788.

(23) See Appendix E.

(24) *Ibid.*

(25) Warren, 6,157, and Gerry, 669; Lincoln, 10,204, and Adams, 3,495. Of the three western counties, Lincoln carried Hampshire and Berkshire; Warren, Worcester. Lincoln received a total of 2,966; Warren, 3,338, while Adams had 649,

alarmed both federalist wings, each imploring the other for the sake of the cause to sacrifice their nominee. But both refused to yield.²⁶ No one of the candidates received a majority and the election went to the General Court. That body, "notwithstanding there is as decided a majority of federalists [among them]...as four to one...yet [actuated] by respect for the 6,000 citizens who voted for Mr. W[arren], and by the...conviction that the Hon. Senate...would accord with the VOICE OF THE PEOPLE [Lincoln had received over 10,000]...sent up Messrs. L[incoln] and W[arren]. The Senate...made choice of...Lincoln...twenty out of twenty-eight votes."²⁷

Antifederalism, with its temporary concomitant of insurgency in Massachusetts, became rapidly unpopular so long as Hancock proclaimed himself a federalist. The change in the temper of the legislature of 1787-8, and 1788-9 is striking, so complete is the revolution.²⁸ Whereas, in the former it had been necessary for the friends of government to exert their "utmost prudence & moderation" in

in these three counties. As for the eastern part, Lincoln carried Suffolk, Essex, Middlesex, Plymouth and Barnstable; Adams, Dukes (39-34 for Lincoln); and Warren, Bristol. In this section the total votes amounted to: Lincoln, 6,338; Warren, 2,371; Adams, 2,328. In the Maine district, Lincoln carried York and Lincoln; Adams, Cumberland. The total votes being: Lincoln, 900; Adams, 518; Warren, 428. As Lincoln had less than a majority—the total vote being 21,906, the House sent up Lincoln and Warren to the Senate which, by a vote of 20 out of 28, chose the former. Lincoln to Washington, Boston, June 3, 1788. Sparks: *Correspondence of the Revolution*, IV:222-3. The writer of the letter quaintly remarks that the Senate "elected Lincoln.... He accepted the trust. I hope he will discharge the duties of his office with fidelity." It is interesting to note—as an evidence of political crookedness very common in those days—the charge that enough votes to elect Lincoln were held up by hostile selectmen until too late to be counted. *Hampshire Chronicle*, May 21, 1788. The reason why there are no votes recorded at the State House in Boston for 1795 from Berkshire County is because they were conveniently "lost" in the mails and arrived just too late. The whole matter is aired in the *Western Star*, May 26, 1795. The High Sheriff and the Postmaster of Pittsfield denied their guilt.

(26) *Mass. Gazette*, March 11, 1788. Tricks were resorted to by the partisans of Adams. *Centinel*, April 5, 9, 1788.

(27) *Ibid.*, May 31, 1788.

(28) Yet on November 2nd, there is actually a motion made and seconded in the House that the consideration of the method of electing United States senators (the Senate and House were in dispute whether it should be done by a joint session or each body voting separately) be postponed until the next session. This striking attempt of anti-federalism did not meet with general approval in that place. *Ibid.*, Nov. 22, 1788.

order that the legislature might end "their session without doing any mischief"²⁹—the senate of the latter it was even complained, "will be charming it will be Federal to a fault, this gives great satisfaction to the men of influence and property and will be a very great shock to an *Anti* and Insurgent lower House."³⁰

When Rufus King wrote that "the conviction of the necessity of good & efficient Government pervades every part of the State"³¹ he was but gathering up the consensus of opinion from all parts of the commonwealth.³² "To universal discontent, the most violent party animosity, and a very alarming decline of industry and manufactures, have succeeded content, quiet and productive labor."³³ How great this change was may be gathered from the fact that "the people in the country begin to have more just and accurate ideas of . . . the Cincinnati."³⁴ This was much the keynote of the next five years.³⁵

(29) N. Gorham to King, Charlestown, April 6, 1788. King: King, I:324.

(30) This statement is quite borne out by William Pynchon's note in his Diary: "In the Senate, there are no more antifederalists members than what are barely sufficient to 'make a shade to the picture'..." p. 309. See also Mass. Gazette, May 30, 1788; Jackson to Knox, Boston, April 20, 1788, Knox MSS. XXII:19; King to Knox, Boston, June 16, 1788: "Every account must confirm to you the information of the surprising change in Government perhaps at no time has there been more able and honest men in the administration of this State..." Ibid, XXII:37.

(31) Ibid.

(32) William Tudor to Washington, Boston, July 26, 1788: "the entire extinction [of the Rebellion] has...most thoroughly tamed many turbulent spirits in all parts of the State." Sparks: Correspondence of the Revolution, IV:229. "The spirit of insurgency is very much abated, and in many towns entirely extinct." Centinel, April 19, 1788. See the account of several towns notorious for their anti-federalism which had completely changed. Ibid, Dec. 24, 31, 1788. M. Cutler to Knox, Ipswich, May 3, 1788. Knox MSS. XXII:32: "antifederalism is become very unpopular in this part of Ye State [Essex county]. Those who have been leaders are totally silent, or have changed sides."

(33) Ibid.

(34) Centinel, April 19, 1788. So violent had the storm been against this society that the General Court of Massachusetts had passed a resolution against it. Salem Gazette, March 23, April 1, 1784. For the change in general see Lincoln to Washington, Boston, June 3, 1788. Sparks: Correspondence of the Revolution, p. 223. Nevertheless the prejudice against that society continued. See Hampshire Gazette, Feb. 20, 1793; S. Breck to Knox, March 6, 1791. Knox MSS. XXVII:156: "the Governors & S. Adam's interest is against me, on account of the Cincinnati..." Same to same, Aug. 30, 1790, Ibid, XXVI:161, "John Gardiner will come out in the Centinel [Chronicle is meant]...in a most violent attack upon the Cincinnati—he has already written twenty numbers..."

(35) Undoubtedly the return of better times contributed to this period of comparative quietude in politics. See the Centinel, Sept. 12, 30, Dec. 26, 1789; Herald of Freedom, Feb. 5, 1790. The adoption of the Constitution operated to restore

So far as political events dealing strictly with the state are concerned it was emphatically a time of peace as compared with the period before or after.³⁶

The ripple of excitement in 1789³⁷ caused by Stephen Higginson's severe strictures upon Hancock, failed to shake the people's unbounded devotion.³⁸ Its only appreciable effect was halving Bowdoin's support which he had received in 1787.³⁹ It

confidence and stimulate industry. Yet if an anti-federalist writer in the Massachusetts Gazette of January 1, 1788, may be believed, "trade [was] expanding, resources opening, settlements enlarging, manufactures increasing and publick debts diminishing" even before. Many items begin to crowd the papers in regard to the establishment of manufactures, the increase of trade and the revival of ship building. See, e. g., Centinel, May 25, July 2, Dec. 31, 1788; Mass. Gazette, April 22, June 13, 1788; Centinel, Jan. 7, 24, June 10, July 1, Aug. 1, 1789, especially July 29, Aug. 22, Sept. 19, 1789. What a change had come about since 1786, when there was an adverse trade balance against Massachusetts of £24,500 (Am. Herald, May 15, 1786) and when such a gloomy picture was drawn in the Massachusetts Gazette for June 12, 1788: "The British ...furnish us with every thing in the way of manufacture...over southern sister states send us bread to eat, from Connecticut we draw our supplies of corn... pork, and other good things; a number of...ship-carpenters, at the eastward [Nova Scotia] are...employed in building our vessels." The last was the most cruel stab of all.

(36) The campaign for federal representatives opened early. In late July we are told that "a spirit of persecution is abroad with vehement declamation against British influence and connections in order to blast the fairest reputations." Centinel, July 23, 1788. Much is said in the next month regarding the last desperate efforts of the antifederalists to get into office by using "the stalking horse of Amendments." Ibid, Aug. 27, 30, Sept. 3, 6, 20, 1788. At the same time presidential electors were to be chosen. The most interesting contest was between Fisher Ames and Samuel Adams, which the former won. Ibid, Dec. 10, 13, 17, 1788. The most long drawn out struggle was that between T. Sedgwick and W. Lyman. Five trials were necessary, as the law demanded a majority, the former finally winning—May 26, 1789—by 9 votes. Ibid, May 27, 30, 1787. Yet this struggle was more a locality contest than anything else, Lyman representing the Hampshire section, Sedgwick the Berkshire portion of the congressional district, which was for this election composed of the two most western counties. In 1790, the accusations against the representatives seeking re-election have little to do with party lines. See Centinel, Sept. 29, Oct. 6, Nov. 24, 1790. The lack of interest due to absence of an opposition party is indicated in these years by a dwindling vote in Boston, e. g., in the election for the "Boston Seat" in May the highest vote for a candidate is 307. Ibid, May 9, 1792. The year before the highest was 478. Six of the seven successful candidates receiving 478, 473, 472, 472, 471, the other 348 and his opponent 110. Ibid, May 11, 1791. In the fall of 1792 it was noted that "the greatest urbanity was observed in the canvass" for presidential electors and congressmen. Ibid, Nov. 3, 1792. For the gubernatorial election of 1790 there is no mention of the fact in the Hampshire Gazette.

(37) See Appendix F.

(38) The struggle was enlivened and likewise embittered by the celebrated writings of "Laco" which were published in the Centinel of Feb. 18, 21, 25, 28, March 4, 7, 14, 21, 25, number 7 being omitted and number 10 being designed for number 3. They were reprinted as Ten Chapters in the Life of John Hancock, New York, 1857. Stephen Higginson is now generally accredited with the authorship, as indeed he was then. Some person, however, wickedly suggested that "Laco" was Samuel Adams: "As it is well known that this venerable gentleman has for a number of years held the very language, in public and private conversation, as appears in these places..." Centinel, March 18, 1789.

(39) Amory (Sullivan, I:250) asserts that he withdrew in 1789. This is probably a mistake, for he received a fair support. The following year—1790—his supporters dwindled again by nearly half; the vote for Bowdoin in 1787 being 6,394; in 1789, 3,457; in 1790, 1,880. There are two insertions in the Centinel, March 27, 31, 1790, which make it evident that in 1790 Bowdoin did withdraw from the canvass.

was the defeat of Lincoln by Adams which demonstrated to the federalists beyond cavil how great the power of Hancock was and how slightly federalistic ideas were held by the people. Confident in the popularity of Lincoln they expected to carry the lieutenant-governorship and yet the reversal of the earlier attitude of the General Court ought to have served as a warning.⁴⁰ The campaign was not, on the surface, a strenuous one. It seems to have been agreed that "To remove the chief Magistrate will be impossible...Peace cannot...be effected that way." Hence to heal the breach, Adams was proposed.⁴¹ Nothing could be urged against Lincoln except that "the Governor does not like [him]...and will not join with him to effect the publick good."⁴²

Not only was the federalist party overthrown in the major contests but certain senators for whom they battled were defeated.⁴³ The people of Massachusetts separated carefully their state and federal political predilections at this time.⁴⁴ They saw no reason why their governor and state representatives should belong necessarily to the Federalist party.

(40) Ibid, Nov. 3, 5, 12, 15, 1788. Ibid, Jan. 10, 14, 17, 21, 24, Feb. 11, 1789.

(41) Ibid, March 18, 1789. An argument which was advanced in the same paper doubtless had considerable weight. It was asserted: "Besides, should [Lincoln]...not obtain a re-election, he will be most certainly provided for under the Federal Government." This prediction was verified, but it was owing entirely to the self-sacrificing generosity of Jonathan Jackson. See Amory: Sullivan, I:249. Both the leading candidates for lieutenant-governor were in straitened circumstances but Samuel Adams could not hope for favors from the Federal government.

(42) Centinel, March 14, 1789. It is evident, however, that the friends of Samuel Adams, now comprising the powerful Hancock party, were assailing Lincoln by attacking their old enemies. For it is said: "The scribblers in the partial [Massachusetts] Gazette and Chronicle...[assert that Lincoln's] friends and associates are aristocrats, &c., and that therefore, he ought to be sacrificed... Who are the intimates at our St. James's? Are not some of them allens...inveterate Tories...and others who have once borne arms against their country?" Ibid.

(43) S. Breck to Knox, Boston, April 19, 1789. Knox MSS. XXIII:166.

(44) D. Cobb to Knox, Boston, Dec. 5, 1792. Ibid, XXXIII:39: "Our Elections this day are unanimous for the old King [Washington] & his second,—partie influence has had no effect on the votes of the latter..." So thoroughly discouraged were the federalists that their greatest hopes were to effect a change in the Senate, for there were "in that branch too many of the family of the Honesti [radical democrats]; and the insurgent spirit was often too visible in a majority of them." But this only was to be attempted if it could be accomplished without raising the "electioneering Spirit." S. Higginson to John Adams, Boston, March 24, 1790. Am. Hist. Assn. Rep. I (1896) 777.

They still desired economies in government, even, it would seem, to refusing to pay the state debt lest there should be a large landed tax.⁴⁵ The legislature, controlled by Hancock and his party, manifested an attitude of lively suspicion toward fancied encroachments on the part of the Federal government. The whole result was decisive enough⁴⁶ to shatter whatever lingering hope the federalists might have for the present of carrying the state in any fashion, to say nothing of ousting Hancock.⁴⁷ For the latter,

(45) See strictures on the dishonesty of the House in this respect as late as 1790. *Centinel*, March 20. On May 27, 1791, Hancock addressed the General Court on the subject of the state debt and honesty. Very great credit must be given him for the strong stand he took against raising money for state expenses by the not unusual method of lotteries. *Ibid.*, May 28, 1791. In the question of "Assumption" the antifederal majority became a minority. Despite the speech of Hancock in which he discovered his particularistic attitude when he said, "I am not convinced of the propriety of the General Government's assuming to pay the debts of this Commonwealth without the request or consent of the Government" (*Centinel*, June 2, 1790), the people were so "damned mad and almost ripe for anything" (S. Breck to Knox, Boston, June 27, 1790. Knox MSS. XXVI:87. See also same to same, Boston, April 25, 1790. *Ibid.*, XXVI:36) that the House instructed their federal representatives to work for assumption by a vote of 83 to 41. *Centinel*, June 5, 1790. See also *ibid.*, Sept. 4, 1790. N. Gorham to Knox, Boston, Jan. 20, 1790. Knox MSS. XXV:104: "The antifederalists very generally circulated an idea that the People will be subjected to a very heavy and perpetual Land Tax in consequence of it—this is a most powerful Engine with which to work." On Jan. 21st the House by a vote of 137 to 24 declared federal office holders "similar to those declared by the [Mass.] Constitution [incapable of] holding seats in the Legislature..." *Herald of Freedom*, Jan. 29, 1790. See also *ibid.*, Jan. 22, June 8, 1790. A proposal that Massachusetts purchase 400 shares of capital stock in the Bank of the United States was lost by a great majority, although the argument in favor was that it would be a good check upon the Federal government and also "preventing the influence being placed among the National Aristocracy of the country." *Centinel*, June 15, 1790. It was even proposed that the state legislature should pay their own federal senators and representatives as formerly. *Herald of Freedom*, March 12, 1790.

(46) Lincoln carried Essex, Plymouth, Barnstable, Dukes and Nantucket, Hampshire, and Berkshire counties. He had lost Suffolk, York and Cumberland and only gained the unimportant county of Dukes and Nantucket. The only two large counties he carried were Essex and Hampshire. In the former his vote was scaled from 2,125 (in 1788) to 1,017—Adams increasing his from 68 to 929. It would seem from the totals that the erstwhile insurgent-antifederalist faction which, deserting Hancock, cast over 6,000 votes for Warren the previous year, had now returned to the Hancockian fold. Lincoln received 10,204 votes in 1787; in 1788, 8,473. [Adams received 3,495; Warren, 6,157, in 1787.] The vote for Adams in 1788 was 10,883. "Nor," as a writer remarked in the cause of a defense of Hancock in 1789, "is there such mighty inconsistency in voting for Mr. Gerry last and Mr. Hancock this year..." *Hampshire Gazette*, May 13, 1789. See also *ibid.* for May 6.

(47) Yet how far from organized the party or parties were is demonstrated by such items as "There are upwards of Forty Candidates for Electors of President, voter for, in the County of Worcester." *Centinel*, Jan. 3, 1789; "for these seats [in Congress]...from present appearances there will be nearly 1,200 candidates." *Ibid.*, Sept. 8, 1789. A "serious" writer four days earlier in the same paper says: "It is no wonder...that Congress is so greatly traduced as it is...for there are almost 50 new candidates for Federal Representatives." *The Centinel*, Aug. 28, 1790, says: "There are almost innumerable candidates in this state for Federal Representatives." How little party names meant then is shown by a recommendation of Heath and Varnum, out and out antifederalists, who are nominated as being possessed of "real Federalism, true Republicanism and substantial property..." *Ibid.*, Dec. 17, 1788. And this, too, in the *Centinel*!

by his attitude toward Lincoln, gave that party clearly to understand that he was strong enough in Massachusetts to do whatever he pleased. As a matter of fact it is very possible he felt he had a just grievance against them in the presidential election of 1789.⁴⁸ Whatever the agreement, and both sides felt a natural reluctance to air the matter, Hancock received not even the compliment of a solitary vote from Massachusetts for either office.

From that time until his death, cloaked with the glamor of his pretentious patriotism and popular virtues, he made a handsome figure-head for his ship of state. And the federalists, content to keep their hold on the state senate,⁴⁹ and thereby elect their own friends to the United States Senate despite

(48) It is probable—judging from Hancock's well known characteristics—that he, knowing the impossibility of being elected early in the fall, began to wreak his vengeance on Lincoln, who was a genuine federalist and supported by what were called by their opponents (the whilom Amendment federalists, who were the larger portion of the Hancockian party) the "high flying Federalists" (see Amory: Sullivan, I:223). What was known early to Hancock soon began to be apparent to other observers. Jackson to Knox, Boston, Dec. 21, 1788. Knox MSS. XXIII:43: "from the appearance of the Persons that will be chosen Electors, I should doubt whether Mr. H— will be Elected V:P—." Certainly his persecution of Lincoln angered the federalists. As it is fair to assume, Hancock would not have done this had he any hopes for federalistic support it must have been done in a spirit of petty revenge. A letter of Jackson to Knox, Jan. 7, 1789, (Knox MSS. XXIII:90) seems to point this way: "I believe there is no doubt who will be president and Vice—people talk pretty loud and open that Mr. J. A. must & will be the man for V...but you may be assured that the other person [Hancock] will stand no chance—if it was merely his want of health it would be sufficient...the breach between him and the Lt. Gr. grows wider and wider..." The only actual account of the bargain is the well known letter of King to Knox. King: King, I:319. It is possible that the federalists believed themselves absolved from their agreement by the entrance of Virginia into the union. Further by supporting him at the polls that spring (1788) they likewise may have believed that they had acquitted themselves handsomely. Hancock's next move would be to solicit support as vice-president and that the federalists declined. If so their refusal would have angered Hancock, who proceeded to vent his wrath on Lincoln.

(49) The best example is the lengthy struggle over the first election of United States senators. Caleb Strong was easily elected. The House persisted in sending up C. Jarvis twice, only to have the Senate non-concur. Then the House sent up N. Dane. He was not acceptable to the Senate who sent down Dalton. The House, after a struggle, accepted the dictation by the upper House. Centinel, Nov. 22, 26, 1788. Yet the question was primarily not that of party, but of the classes in the state to be represented. Caleb Strong—from Northampton—represented the landed interest and it was necessary to have the other senator represent the commercial interest. Ibid, Nov. 5, 1788. There does not seem to be a party question again in 1790 when electing a successor, Dalton. Ibid, June 23, 30, 1790. In 1796 the Senate had its way again by refusing to ratify the choice of the House. Centinel, June 11, 15, 1796. The federalism of the Senate is indicated by the answer to the acting governor's (Adams) speech in the winter of 1794. Ibid, Feb. 5, 1794. See action of the House in respect to this reply (Ibid, Feb. 8, 1794) and their answer to the Governor (Adams) June 7, 1794. Ibid, June 11, 1794. Their reply, on February 18th, is in ibid, Feb. 22, 1794.

the struggles of the democratic house, bided their time, convinced after repeated failures that any "design" to supplant Hancock in the steadfast affection of the people,⁵⁰ "must prove abortive."⁵¹ So far then as state parties were concerned, there was but one, and that dominated by Hancock, who stood strongly for state sovereignty,⁵² in which attitude

(50) Centinel, Oct. 9, 1793. The only opposition which Hancock was called upon to encounter since Bowdoin's meagre showing in 1790 was even less formidable. In 1793 Gerry was nominated for governor. Centinel, March 2, 6, 9, 13, 30. He fared even worse, being defeated by 18,225 to 867. There is some evidence that Gerry was maliciously put up by his enemies. Ibid, March 2, 1793. In the Hampshire Gazette for March 27, 1793, a correspondent writes: "a few years since our present governor resigned...on...account [of ill health] notwithstanding, we were so unreasonable as to vote him in again...it looks as tho' we had a design upon his health, and were determined to kill him... Such treatment of a Negro would raise a great clamor... For shame my countrymen...how unreasonable and cruel you are!" The cause for this great solicitude over Hancock's failing health is the desire of the writer to elect Samuel Phillips governor (since he attaches that name to the end of the article). See also Centinel, March 6, 1793.

(51) Ibid, Feb. 14, 1789.

(52) Hancock's vanity rather than principles—it would seem—led him to strike this attitude on every possible opportunity. His behavior on the occasion of the visit of Washington is a good example of this inordinate development. His anxiety to magnify the state was because of the fact that he was at its head and this assumption of superiority was properly rebuked by Washington. See, e. g., Hancock's two well contrived letters inviting Washington to stay with him. Sparks: Correspondence of the Revolution, IV:289-291. The attempt of the federalists to avoid an open rupture with Hancock is evident by their treatment of this incident. There is no mention of it in the newspapers at the time, except for one rather broad hint in reply to some threat of the "Hancocknians." Mass. Gazette, Nov. 16, 1789. See C. Gore's significant letter to King in reference to this newspaper writer and the incident. Boston, Dec. 3, 1789. King: King, I:369; also see the direct statement of F. Ames to T. Dwight, Boston, Oct. 21, 1789. Works, pt. I, p. 73; same to same, Boston, Oct. 30, 1789, *ibid*, p. 74. See, however, Drake: Old Landmarks of Middlesex, pp. 14-15. Gorham's assertion here must be questioned, first, because the denial is evidently written for that very purpose; further, Gorham was a friend of Hancock and a member of the Council and no great friend to Bowdoin and the federalists. Besides the direct and contemporary evidence is overwhelmingly against Gorham's contention. Gerry to King, Boston, May 27, 1789. King: King, I:100. And finally, Hancock's ruse of ill-health had been worked threadbare before this. S. Breck to Knox, Boston, Feb. 1, 1789. Knox MSS. XXIII:90: "Governor Hancock remains very sick, & I believe will continue so, until the General Government is set in motion—" B. Hichborn to Knox, Boston, March 5, 1789. Knox MSS. XXIII:123: "Hancock is yet sick but no seriously as I expected he would be on the election of Adams...[as] Vice President." Nevertheless Hancock did recover sufficiently to invite John Adams "to take a cold out at his house on the day of his departure" for the seat of the Federal government. Jackson to Knox, Boston, March 22, 1789. Knox MSS. XXIII:138. See for other information regarding Hancock's curiously convenient illness, Harding: Fed. Constitution in Mass., p. 85, and above Chap. 2, note 37. Hancock's vanity was admitted even by his friends. S. Breck to Knox, Boston, Feb. 7, 1790. Knox MSS. XXV:127: "Hancock has been not a little displeased with you in consequence of some letter you have lately written him in your Official Character, in which I believe he thinks was not expressed respectfully enough to the first Magistrate of this Commonwealth—" Hancock's consistent opposition to the Federal government actually elicits a veiled rebuke from the clergyman who delivered the annual election sermon in 1791. Robbins, C., Boston, May 25, 1791, p. 46. His refusal to sign the act giving the "light houses &c to Congress" is quite in accordance with his general position. S. Breck to Knox, Boston, June 21, 1790. Knox MSS. XXVI:87.

he was in cordial agreement with his lieutenant-governor, Samuel Adams, to whom the leadership was to fall at his death, October 8th, 1793.⁵³

⁵³ (53) See a sarcastic piece in the Centinel—March 9, 1793—concerning Adams' forgetfulness of his oft repeated injunction "rotation in office" since he himself had begun to sit in the high places.

CHAPTER VI.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AS VIEWED BY THE PEOPLE IN MASSACHUSETTS.

With keen interest and sympathy America was closely watching the events in France which were transforming, as they too fondly believed, an ancient despotism into a republic. And when the news of the great success of the French armies in the fall and winter of 1792 was brought to this country, a great wave of universal enthusiasm swept the land.¹ Even sober-minded New England caught the contagion which broke out in Boston and vicinity in the shape of public entertainments in which all classes of citizens participated.² These "civic feasts" inaugurated a reign of follies and extravagances in thought, speech and custom, on which, however, the sobering and startling news of the execution of Louis XVI put an effectual damper.³ That date may be taken as the time when opposition to this delusive frenzy for everything French began to crystallize,⁴ to openly contend for the honor of America

(1) These were but the culmination of the growth of interest, since indeed official notice had been taken in 1790 of the French successes. On September 17th of that year the House appointed a committee which, when joined with members of the Senate, should prepare an address to the National Assembly of France "expressive of the satisfaction they have felt on the progress of the Revolution in that country." *Centinel*, Sept. 18, 1790.

(2) See Appendix G.

(3) "The news of the King's death...[replaced] that joy, and satisfaction... in Boston [with] a frowning sadness...upon the brows of some...a cold...salute succeeded to the warm embrace which Frenchmen had been wont to receive, and in a great variety of instances, I was shunned..." This piece was supposed to be written by a "Frenchman" in the *Ind. Ch.*, Dec. 28, 1795. Dr. Tappan was accused of writing the following extract which the *Independent Chronicle* took from "The True Briton"—a London paper—said to have been written by "a professor in the University in Cambridge in New England..." "The French cause was popular in this country before they murdered the mild Louis XVI. The deed is universally execrated. His death, and the atheistical sentiments uttered and applauded in their Convention, have lost them the esteem and good wishes of all the commonality of North America." Dr. Tappan denied having written it in *ibid.*, May 25, 1795.

(4) *Am. Apollo*, March 22, 1793, from the *Am. Daily Advertiser*. "It has become very common, among our well-born, the King's men, aristocrats and office-bearers, to depreciate the principle of liberty and equality, because some temporary excesses have taken place in France." The rift in the lute is shown by the significant emphasis seen in a paragraph from the *Independent*

and to sharply remind Americans that patriotism must begin at home. To increase and strengthen this attitude of the people nothing, on the whole, contributed more than the zealous activities of the clergy after they awoke to the exceeding danger, to country and to religion, of this excessive ardor.⁵

The lack of reflection and judgment by the people in general, indeed the extent of their blind enthusiasm, evinces itself clearly in their unhesitating acceptance of a movement whose inspiration and moving forces were summed up in the great watch words—Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.

The first indeed they knew and prized. But the development abroad soon led them to look askance at this conception of it as savoring more and more of sanguinary executions, of madness rather than reason, and of the rule of a murderous mob.

The idea of equality,⁶ it is true, had been gener-

Chronicle of Aug. 8, 1793. On Aug. 5th arrived La Concorde, the French frigate. "The hills, wharves and many of the houses commanding a view... were covered with the citizens, almost all of whom testified by their loud acclamations and huzzas...[their] pleasure...at seeing the first ship, from our friends the Gallic republicans..."

(5) This ardor for France and the rights of man penetrated even to the wilds of Ohio. A. Wayne to Knox, West Branch of Miami, Nov. 15, 1793. Knox MSS. XXXIV:149: "The same baneful Leaven, which has been and is yet fermenting (in the Atlantic States)...has also been fermenting in this Legion, from the moment of my landing at Hobsons Choice. The rights of man, has been held up as a criterium, even of Military Government. Attempts have frequently been made to evade & disobey orders, under various & unworthy pretexts & idle quibbles, unknown at any period before that time, in the Legion ...to such a pitch was this doctrine carried that a crisis when we had scarcely a Guard & relief...when some young Gentlemen were refused a furlough, they offered their resignation & prepared to depart without any further ceremony...I...[verily] believe...the neglect on the part of the contractors was caused by...[that] many headed monster."

(6) Emmons, N. Franklin, May 9, 1798. "It appears...that a good government equally tends to restrain from tyranny and levelism...[p. 14.] that liberty and equality are inseparably connected...is one of the most wild and absurd [sentiments]...it is a violation of the laws of nature and religion...[p. 15.] [It is a] Utopian scheme of...our infidel enemies..." [p. 24.] Extract from Pres. Fitch's address at the first commencement at Williams college, Sept. 2, 1795: "If...we follow the ghostly Phantom of Liberty and equality, which stalked from the Pandemonium of the Jacobins, with eyes darting fury, and hands dipt in the blood of more than half a million, we shall see the same tragic scenes of devastation, bloodshed and horror...in...our country." Mass. Mercury, Dec. 4, 1795. The French conception of these two ideals was thus ridiculed: "Liberty, such as the Fishewomen of Paris enjoyed when they treated a Queen of France, like a prostitute...and Equality, such as a Le Gendee and Conterie[sic] could boast, when the butcher's stall of the one, and brewer's dray of the other were in a Revolutionary government, on a level with the throne." Brookfield Advertiser, Dec. 16, 1795. From the Farmer's Weekly Museum. A good example of the many sarcastic attacks on "Equality" can be found in the American Apollo, Aug. 20, 1794. See also Kirkland, J. T., Oraton

ated by the Revolution to some extent.⁷ As this notion developed into an alarming principle in Shays' Rebellion—"levelling"—it became odious to men of rank and property as well as to the ordinary conservative citizen. Except for the "furious democrats"⁸ and the politicians of that party, the dictum of John Adams in regard to the necessity of distinctions in well ordered governments⁹ was of common acceptance. Ninety-eight out of every hundred, as they were at the beginning of the 19th century, these descendents of conservative Englishmen had a wholesome regard and respect for those whose tradition it had been to be the leaders and guides of their community, whether ministers or gentry. Yet it was no debasing relation, this; for democratic equality of man and man was in the town meeting and even the minister depended upon his parishioners for continuance in office. Whatever its faults, this system bred a race of leaders and statesmen who possessed a high sense of responsibility and unselfish duty to the highest interest of their constituents. Even the great leaders of the later Republican party in Massachusetts, democratic as they proclaimed and thought themselves to be, believed thoroughly "in all proper distinctions between the Poor and the Rich."¹⁰ Jacksonian De-

...in Harvard College, July 19, 1798, pp. 6-7. See also "Common Sense in Dishabille, Liberty and Equality; A Satire;" *Salem Gazette*, Sept. 26, 1797, from the *Farmer's Weekly Museum*. Also Z. Swift to D. Daggett, Phila., Nov. 11, 1794. *Proc. Am. Antiq. Soc. N. S. IV* (1885-7) 373.

(7) The notion however encountered stiff opposition. Warren: *Hist. of the Am. Revolution*, III:359: "The assumption of an appropriate rank was disgusting [to the aristocrats] in a set of men [officers of the Revolutionary army] who had most of them been taken from mechanic employments, or the sober occupations of agriculture..." See also J. Eliot, Dec. 7, 1782. Belknap Papers, Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., 6th Ser., III: pt. III. p. 240. "So many of our officers were made gentlemen upon going into the army...that they had rather consider twice than submit to a metamorphosis."

(8) *The Centinel*, Jan. 26, 1793, announced—for this was the height of the French frenzy—"To impress on the tender minds of the rising generations the precept of Equal Liberty...all the Youth of this town [Boston], were paraded in State Street, in ranks; between which a Cart was driven, from whence each was presented with a Civic Cake, impressed with the words 'LIBERTY AND EQUALITY...'"

(9) J. Adams to R. Price, N. Y., April 19, 1790. Works, IX:564.

(10) S. Adams to John Adams, July, 1785. S. Adams MSS., N. Y. Public Library. Also E. Gerry to S. Adams, July 17, 1789. Concerning the estab-

mocracy was more than a quarter of a century away in New England.

The last of the sacred trilogy was equally repugnant. Ridicule made short work of its extravagant manifestations. The "fraternal kiss" and the "fraternal hug" were so foreign to the undemonstrative New Englander as to excite his unbounded derision and contempt. Yet so thorough was the approval of the French Revolution in its early stages that the *Centinel* in its issue of June 23rd, 1792, made the extraordinary announcement that there is "a plan of raising a body of *American Volunteers* to embark as soon as possible for France. The Legislature of Massachusetts would do themselves immortal honor, by being the first to provide ["for the support and transportation of these Patriotic Volunteers."]" This proposal was received with calmness and aroused no opposition, although nothing seems to have actually been done.

Throughout the summer of 1792, and especially in the fall, disquieting rumors and accounts of excesses were received chiefly through English sources. Still the *Centinel*, the federalist organ, asserted on October 10th: "We have avoided . . . the falsehoods and absurdities of the English papers—Though we have not a favorable opinion of the *Paris mob* we yet think them incapable of *drinking the bottled blood of the Swiss* . . ." and on November 7th it stoutly affirmed that "NOT WITHSTANDING the late excesses of the Republican party in *France* the cause of the French is still that of humanity—is still the cause of freedom."

With the beginning of the next year came the "Civic Feasts," which marked the height and the end of the harmonious attitude towards France

lishment of a theatre "admit[ting] of amusements which all may partake in without the destroying the necessary distinction of rank." *Ibid.*

which had prevailed in all ranks of society and shades of political belief. Henceforth this question was to divide the people politically, socially and even to some extent religiously, until the end of the Federalist party in Massachusetts. The proclamation of neutrality¹¹ gave the country the opportunity of settling the question once for all whether Americans were to be more loyal to France than to their own country. The emphatic answer of the towns,¹² in Massachusetts as elsewhere, to the efforts of the disloyal in the Boston town-meeting¹³ silenced them for the time being at least.

While the mission of Genet¹⁴ had brought trouble

(11) It was a matter of grave concern to the federalist writers how to meet the charge of ingratitude hurled against the United States for declining to take up arms in behalf of her ally, France. Was it not a disgraceful reproach to America, this reluctance to aid France in her hour of great need? Recollect her unselfishness in our Revolution—did she not enter into a great war for the sake of liberty and the love she bore us? Such were the democratic chimes which rang incessantly. As early as May a certain "Neuter" attempted to prove that France was actuated at that time solely by selfish motives, moreover that she tried her best "to deprive us of the fishery, of an open recognition of our independence by Britain, and of a large part of the territory we now possess. We know also, that the boasted loan of money made to us...was far from being a gratuitous act...it was done on interested motives and the terms were unreasonable and hard upon us." *Centinel*, May 18, 1793. See also *Ibid.*, July 31, Aug. 14, 17, 1793. However true this all was it made no great impression until the French, eager to destroy the sympathy for Louis XVI. and the ancient regime, published documents proving conclusively how thoroughly selfish the Court of France was in the help granted to the Americans. The French leaders proved themselves quite too astute; they had overreached themselves badly and gratitude was not so popular a theme henceforth. *Ibid.*, Aug. 24, 1793. See also *Ibid.*, Feb. 26, 1794.

(12) Many were the towns which manifested by formal action of the citizens their "approbation and gratitude [to the President] for his parental care... and the timely and prudent measures which he hath adopted, for the peace and happiness of the people over whom he presides..." (*Centinel*, Sept. 18, 1793.) but also declared their liveliest resentment towards those "wicked and unprincipled men [who] had endeavored to slander the citizens of the United States by declaring that they were opposed to the principles and conduct enjoined in the late proclamation of our illustrious President, and by asserting that the intentions of the American people did not accord with the conduct of the Federal government." (*Ibid.*) For accounts of the towns see *Centinel*, June 5, July 31, Aug. 3, 7, 10, 21, 24, 28, 31, Sept. 7, 14, 18, 25, Oct. 12, 23, 1793.

(13) *Amory: Sullivan*, 1:290.

(14) Undoubtedly Genet's astonishing forgetfulness of his place and the respect due to the United States helped materially to abate the hitherto frantic zeal for France. See the *Centinel*, July 21, Aug. 14, 17, 21, 24, Sept. 25, 1793. Also F. Ames to T. Dwight, Boston, Aug., 1793. *Works*, pt. 1, p. 129: "The town is less frenzied than it was. Citizen Genet is out of credit..." A characteristic attack upon him is to be found in the *Centinel*, Sept. 11, 1793: "You eagerly attached yourself to the disaffected and depraved...a faction of desperadoes...who will as readily join you in an open rebellion against the government of Heaven, as against that of their country, if your existing Financier can furnish another six million of livres to be judiciously distributed..." See also *Ibid.*, Oct. 16, Nov. 13, 30, 1793; *Mercury*, Nov. 19, 1793. In the *Independent Chronicle* can be found the expected but no less surprising defences in behalf of this "mad Monsieur." See e. g., Jan. 6, 9, 1794.

and embarrassment upon the country at large Massachusetts herself suffered during this year from a number of high-handed and vexatious acts of the French and their adherents. Indeed it would seem that the latter sought to inaugurate a reign of terror, on a minute scale indeed, but enough to cause apprehension and to provoke a growing amount of resentment.

Early in August the frigate *La Concorde* arrived in Boston after participating in the glorious reception of Genet by the "citizens and citesses" of Philadelphia. Attached to her main mast was a placard gibbeting there the names of "eleven of our citizens . . . of the utmost respectability in town [who] were denounced . . . as aristocrats, unfriendly to the French Revolution and averse to having American citizens enter on board French privateers."¹⁵ This very suggestive French custom was not at all relished. The joke, if such it was, had gone too far. A number of indignant citizens went on board demanding that the offensive black list be removed instantly. The officers of the frigate complied with this demand at once, offering at the same time profuse apologies and declarations of their ignorance of the perpetration of the deed.¹⁶ In addition outrageous events occurred which must have alienated any citizen who had the slightest feeling for his country's honor and sovereignty. That same month a regularly French commissioned privateer, the *Roland*,¹⁷ captured an English vessel, the *Grey-*

(15) *Centinel*, Aug. 10, 1793.

(16) *Ibid.* In the same issue a much incensed writer comments: "When I saw a prophetic intimation in your last . . . that we might soon expect to have some of our own citizens denounced by a Jacobin Club, or in the Jacobin mode; I little thought that prediction would be verified in the same week. But the Jacobin party in every country, are so ardent, and are in the habit so strongly of marching to the tune of *Ca Ira* . . . that, even here they seem to prosecute with as much facility and expedition as . . . in Paris . . ."

(17) This had not been the first excitement over the presence of "French" privateers operating from American ports and manned largely by Americans, for such a vessel was fitted out in Charlestown in July. *Centinel*, July 27, 1793. In accordance with the resolutions of a meeting of merchants on July 22,

hound, and brought it into Boston.¹⁸ In accordance with the proclamation of neutrality, four Americans belonging to this French commissioned vessel were arrested.¹⁹ The attempt of a deputy-marshal to serve his writ from the United States Circuit Court for the Eastern District, was forcibly prevented by the commanding officer of the *La Concorde* and he was kept a prisoner for nearly three days and nights; and finally the *Greyhound* was most audaciously removed under the guns of that man of war.²⁰ Indeed it was only after this vessel sailed, months later, that the federal officers were able to carry out the orders of the court.²¹ In the meantime Hancock had "the two prizes of the *Rowland* seized."²² The instigator of this impudent interference with the American court and the nullifying of its orders was the French vice consul for Boston, Duplaine.²³ He was arrested, but the grand jury after three attempts, although the last failed through the obstinacy of one juror only, was unable to bring in a true bill.²⁴ The President, however, took away his equator, despite the clamors of the "American Jacobins." Dannery, who had already superseded the indicted consul, unmindful of Genet's fiasco, had the bad taste to write a spirited protest to Samuel Adams against the dismissal.²⁵ This brought forth

(Ibid. July 24.) and a town meeting on July 26, (Ibid. July 27.) to prevent the fitting out of this supposed French privateer—which had already sailed on the 20th—it was asserted that it had returned and landed its stores. "It is well known," comments a writer in the latter paper, "that another privateer, commissioned by the French nation, hath been lying in Nantasket road more than a week." See also Ibid. July 27, Aug. 19, 1793.

(18) Amory: Sullivan. I:286.

(19) Centinel, Aug. 24, 1793.

(20) Ibid. Dec. 21, 1793.

(21) Ibid. The Marshall of the District repeatedly applied to the French captain to withdraw his men, but "he produced the orders of Mr. Duplaine, for his justification and refused to comply..."

(22) Ibid. Aug. 28, 31, 1793.

(23) Jefferson orders C. Gore, U. S. Attorney for Massachusetts, to have this French consul arrested since by express clauses in the consular convention with France he is "liable to arrest, imprisonment, and other punishments even capital." Phila., Sept. 2, 1793. Writings. Memorial Ed. IX:215-6.

(24) Centinel, Nov. 6, 16, Dec. 18, 1793. It was charged by the federalists that the jury was packed by the Constitutional Club.

(25) Ibid. Nov. 13, 1793.

many severe strictures against the vice consul, and also demands to know "whether the incendiary proceedings of the Consul..has met his [Adams'] most pointed indignation."²⁶

The partisans of both sides busied themselves with gathering statistics²⁷ more or less closely based on facts, and interviewing ship master and owners, instigated thereunto by the self-respecting and patriotic duty of attempting to prove which nation, France or England, was treating the United States with the greater contempt.²⁸ But the English sympathizers, aided perhaps by the larger inventive faculty, had the better of the argument, especially when the crew of the "Citizen Genet pirate" "robbed and cruelly beat" Captain Henderson of Salem, just off the coast of Massachusetts.²⁹

The topic which was singled out for the greatest amount of attention amid all these other excitements, was the agitating news of the proposed formation of a branch of the Jacobin clubs, or, better perhaps, the Democratic Societies. It was organized under the somewhat misleading, but euphonious title of the Constitutional Club.³⁰ The alarming rumor was bruited about in August that "we are to have a club . . . upon the true *Jacobin principles* . . . under the specious name of the Democratic Society. . . These and such like apprehensions disturb the minds of many

(26) Ibid; also see the Am. Apollo, Nov. 13; Centinel, Dec. 4, 8, 25, 1793, the last from the Western Star. See also ibid and Ind. Ch., Jan. 20, 1794, for a characteristic democratic attitude toward this affair and a defense of Adams.

(27) This game was in full swing by June. See the Centinel, June 29, also Aug. 27, Nov. 2, 16, 1793.

(28) Boston federalists note the curious fact "That all the Captains of American Vessels who have received insults and outrages from the British cruisers, should be those who have arrived in Philadelphia and New York." Ibid, July 20, 1793. The authenticity of such is severely doubted and the charge made that "very few...of these complaints [against the British] have been attested to; and some...are known to be the fabrications of certain earwigs, and dependants on the French minister." Ibid, Nov. 2, 1793; see also ibid, April 19, 1794.

(29) Ibid, Nov. 2, 13, 1793, see ibid, Nov. 5, for an outrageous act committed by the La Concorde against Capt. Hiller in Boston harbor.

(30) Amory: Sullivan, 1:275.

good citizens.”³¹ And many good citizens, especially the leading ones, possessed of undemocratic sentiments, were destined to be unpleasantly disturbed for the next year or so by these noisy and effectively organized politicians. These societies occupied the attention of excited newspaper writers to such an extent that there are few issues of the *Columbian Centinel* during 1794, which do not denounce in unmeasured terms this “chain of clubs..from Maine

(31) *Centinel*, Aug. 7, 1793. It is evident that before the end of November the Club is organized. *Mass. Mercury*, Nov. 29, 1793; *Centinel*, Nov. 30, 1793. In January its principles and constitution are published. *Ind. Ch.*, Jan. 16, 1794.

(32) *Am. Apollo*, Oct. 9, 1794. See the *Mass. Mercury*, Nov. 29, 1793: “the business of this nocturnal club will be to denounce citizens, pack juries, abuse government, instruct congress and for ought we know, erect Guillotines.” [All these prophecies except the last were literally fulfilled. See *Centinel*, Nov. 30, 1793.] The *Centinel*, Jan. 1, 1794, quotes a report by the Massachusetts legislature March 22d, 1784, which denounced “Self-created Societies” (in that case it was the Society of the Cincinnati), using language which exactly fitted the present situation. For other criticisms see *ibid.*, May 31, Aug. 20, Aug. 27 (on the Anvil Club). “Manlius” attacks the Club in a series of articles, which seven in number with an extra, (evidently originally printed in the *Greenfield Gazette*) are in the *Centinel*, Sept. 3, 6, 10, 13, 17, 20, 24, 27, 1794. It was published as a pamphlet Oct. 15, 1794. The interference of the Boston Club in politics was marked by an incident which galled their opponents excessively as well as showed a plain lack of respect and confidence in their Congressman. The resolutions of the town meeting on May 12th on the Embargo (See *Centinel*, May 14, 1794) were sent by the town clerk William Cooper, a strong democrat, to the Virginia representatives and not to their own Congressman. See *ibid.*, May 28, 31 and Sept. 10, 1794. The effectiveness of the club is shown by this town meeting which easily carried resolutions in favor of the Embargo, despite the objections of S. Higginson, H. G. Otis and J. C. Jones. Amory: Sullivan, I:291. See also “Mercator” in *Centinel*, May 10, 14, 1794, who opposes the Embargo. The effects of it are noted in *ibid.*, June 7, 1794. But see *ibid.*, May 24, 1794, and *Hampshire Gazette*, June 11, 1794. Their strength is clearly shown by the vote in Boston, May 7th, for the “Boston Seat” that year. The five democratic candidates won by 539, 553, 556, 435, 406 votes, their opponents getting but 262, 270, 194, 129, 116 votes. There were two “union” candidates who received 697 and 690 votes. *Centinel*, May 10, 1794. “Deodatus” writes a series of three attacks upon the club. *Centinel*, Sept. 13, 27, Oct. 11, 1794. “Mortimer” carries on the assault in *ibid.*, Oct. 18, 25 and Nov. 1, 1794. While the weapons of invective and denunciation were more commonly used than ridicule yet the latter was also employed. “On a motion (says the *Am. Apollo*, June 12, 1794, from the *Gazette of the U. S.*) ...in a Democratic Society...Mr. B. request[ed]...permission to fill his balloon at a chimney top of the Hall during a warm debate; one member... asked, where is your equality, and...your levelling principles, Citizens, that you would thus aid a flighty, over-bearing attempt to soar above the people?... [this] attempt to...elevat[e]...an individual above the multitude, must be aristocratic...we have never heard of the force or effect of Democratic Gaz, when tied up in a bag...The balloon...may mount...before the...cords can be detached from the Hall, and [take]...us all...along...the Lord knows where—No, citizens, although we have frequently met to propose high-flying and dangerous projects for others, I never understood that we were to trust our own carcasses in the voyage.” See for alleged attempts “to influence the press” by threats and boycott, *Mass. Mercury*, Jan. 3, 1794; and *Centinel*, Oct. 8, 1794, from the *Eastern Herald*, Portland, [Me.].

to South Carolina. .the most daring [and] . . dangerous league of aristocracy.'"³²

Angry passions had so largely invaded all ranks of society that only the clergy as yet held aloof from controversy. The editors of the two leading Boston papers fall most thoroughly afoul of one another. Benjamin Russel, editor of the *Centinel*, was haled before the court where he received a nominal fine for assault and battery upon the person of Benjamin Austin, "old Honestus," perhaps the most industrious writer for the *Chronicle*, and a leader of the Boston democrats.³³ Henceforth both parties, with little attention to the truth, set themselves to invent the most inflammatory and false stories in order to suit their own political ends.³⁴ Does war with Great Britain seem to threaten? The democrats are indefatigable with unfounded or infinitely exaggerated tales of cruelties and depredations. Is war imminent with France? The federalists busy themselves in casting up a mythical amount of losses

(33) The editors of the *Centinel* and *Chronicle* took sides as every one else. The editor of the former paper was tried for assault and battery on Benjamin Austin, chief writer of the *Chronicle*, who received nominal damages in the shape of £1, having asked £1,000. *Centinel*, March 13, 20, 1793. In the issue of Aug. 17th, the editor of the *Centinel* remarks that the *Chronicle* "has again insinuated...that...the Editor...is in the British pay..." In reply the editor "knows that the French National Convention has appropriated Five or Six Million livres, as secret service money: But, knowing the fact, he will not recriminate the charge, that the Editor of the *Chronicle* is under French pay.—For the Editor of the *Centinel* has a very high opinion of the judgment of the French Executive Council." Another example of *Centinel* wit is "The *Chronicle* charges the *Centinel* with being 'a standing Imposture'—Thank God, it is not like its antagonist a 'lying one.'" May 14, 1794. From this time on the editors pay their respects to each other with the scantiest regards to courtesy and decency. There had been bad blood before and these excitements merely gave opportunity for the renewal of old grudges and paying off old scores. E. g., B. Russel announces that "it is his intention...so long as he continues to receive the support of the patriotick and judicious...still to continue to give...political observations...notwithstanding...sunshine federalists, and summer friends to the constitution—or to the envy and malice of contemporary Editors." *Centinel*, June 25, 1788. See also *Ind. Ch.*, Feb. 24, 1794; *Centinel*, Feb. 26, 1794; *ibid.*, Aug. 11, 1792. When the Rev. Mr. French spoke on "detraction" in his sermon, May 24, 1798, in reference to a certain newspaper, both editors hastened to praise the discerning, truthful and patriotic clergyman.

(34) Such a canard was the rumor that the French were engaged in recruiting soldiers in Boston for the "Genet Regiment" whose object was "One of the Spanish settlements...after the insurrection of the Southern Negroes should be agected." *Centinel*, Nov. 20, 1793. See also *ibid.*, Dec. 13, 16; *Mass. Mercury*, Jan. 14, 1794. So untrustworthy were the democratic reports from Virginia that the term "Norfolk News" was synonymous with a falsehood. See e. g. Paine: *The Invention of Letters*, p. 8, 3d ed., Boston, 1819.

and multiply to an impossible degree the number and gravity of the insults offered to the United States.

The reports of bloody events in France had increased so persistently by the year 1793, that the Hampshire Gazette admits on February 6th: "It is a melancholy sensation to the generous admirers of the French people that the raptuous emotions of their success is, at every interval, dashed with some dejecting feelings, arising from their violence, . . . precipitancy . . . intolerance, or . . . cruelty."³⁵ And with a curious forgetfulness of the treatment of the Loyalists it goes on to say that the banishment of the "émigrés" is "as impolitic as it is cruel, for no nation can reap from confiscation. Men are the most valuable property of the nation."³⁶

It was the execution of Louis XVI which occasioned the first great revulsion of feeling and marked the ebbing of the high tide of sympathy and enthusiasm. The people were profoundly grateful to the king for his aid in their Revolution, and his death brought forth not a few expressions of grief.³⁷

(35) See also Greenfield Gazette, March 21, 1793; Hampshire Gazette, Jan. 9, 1793. One of the earliest attacks on France for the terrors which were occurring there is an "Ode to Liberty by 'Marie Antoinette.'" Certain of the lines are striking for this early period:

"To the vile rabble's rage resigned
The lustre of thy polish'd mind!
Can Gallia's impious sons defame
The virtues of thy sainted name
And heap th' assassin's deeds on thee!
While to the sway of crime alone
High-seated on a reeking throne
They raise the licens'd hand,
And bend th' unhallowed knee."

The earliest reference the writer has found is an excerpt in the Centinel, Oct. 7, 1792, from the Salem Gazette: "The issue aimed at by the Chief ["the democratical and jesuitical old De Lisle" (probably James Sullivan) "and his disciple . . . Honestus . . . the disappointed abettors of rebellion"] is probably like that of his much admired French Revolution—to level all distinctions of order and authority, and even the property and life; until anarchy and terror may open the door of usurpation to the most hardy and adroit leader . . . These are the blessed effects, the halcyon days, the republican rights and privileges . . . to be expected from . . . this destructive faction."

(36) Greenfield Gazette, March 21, 1793, has an account of the massacres of September 2, 1792. See for more horrors the issue of March 28, 1793. See also Farmer's Weekly Museum, April 11, July 26, 1793; Centinel, June 8, 1793.

(37) Whatever real grief there was it must needs be spoiled by an evidence of that unbecoming and senseless mummery which obsessed so many Americans

Sharp indignation was expressed for "This unjust and iniquitous Judgment,"³⁸ which was even denounced as "Murder."³⁹ And "Cordelia"⁴⁰ said "A few ladies of my acquaintance are determined *openly* to show their respect. . . and to wear. . . for one month a *black rose*, near the left breast."

During this year other items of the atrocities which marked the progress of the Revolution were published in the Massachusetts papers. The attacks by the Jacobins on Lafayette were much resented.⁴¹ A "Patriot of the World" rebukes the French nation for destruction of liberty since "while ochlocratic tyrants outraged the liberty of debate, your National Convention has presented the spectacle of a complex despot. . . The momentous subject of a *Constitution* has been madly neglected."⁴² In the same paper taken from the Connecticut Courant, France is warned that "almost all parties concur in censuring the outrageous proceedings of the mobs in various parts of France."⁴³

It is the next year, 1794, that the criticisms of France are so numerous as to call forth resentments

at that period. E. g. the head of the ox, eaten at the historic Boston Civic Feast, with its horns gilded had been placed on the flag-staff at Liberty Square. It was proposed that this head "should be put in mourning this morning, with the colours half staff high: and that at five o'clock in the afternoon, the flag-staff be cut down, dropped in the dock, and with the head and horns be there buried as an evidence of the truth of the assertion of the patriotic Paine. . . that. . . , 'the news of his [Louis XVI] execution has given them ['the free Americans'] great pain.'" Centinel, March 30, 1793. For the controversy this proposal excited and the struggles which ensued, see Appendix E.

(38) Greenfield Gazette, March 28, 1793.

(39) Hampshire Gazette, April 10, 1793.

(40) Centinel, March 30, 1793. See *ibid.*, March 23, 30, (which contains sundry pieces expressive of sorrow,) and the Hampshire Gazette, April 3, 1793. Six months afterwards it is asserted that "A great proportion of Americans. . . lament the fate of Louis the late king." *Ibid.*, Sept. 12, 1793. An interesting assertion is made "that the decollation of the late King of the French, is very generally disapproved of: and by the dispassionate yeomanry of the interior country, more than by the citizens of the sea-ports." Centinel, June 19, 1793. It is not to be supposed that the French did not find defenders for this course. See e. g. Fed. Spy, April 30, 1793. In the issue of April 3, 1793, of the Centinel is a violent anti-regicide piece paralleling the unfortunate Charles I. with "the Capetian." See ante chap. VI, note 3. The confirmation of the execution was announced in double capitals. Centinel, March 23, 1793; see also the Hampshire and Berkshire Chronicle, April 2, 1793.

(41) Greenfield Gazette, March 14, 1793; Hampshire Gazette, June 26, 1793.

(42) *Ibid.*, Sept. 18, 1793.

(43) *Ibid.*, for massacres of July 2d, "twelve innocent persons Guillotined."

couched in the following terms: "But too many of our cold phlegmatick countrymen, . . . are disposed to censure the measures, adopted by the French, as rash and barbarous. Many . . . have labored to blacken the cause of the French."⁴⁴ The newspapers came in for rebukes. "Many papers . . . once neutral . . . now teem with anathemas against the French and their measures. Now the press groans in elegy; next erupts a Vesuvian mass of sulphurous abuse, and gulphs of lampoon and scurrility."⁴⁵ While the other side retorts: "NOTHING can be more displeasing to a lover of truth, than the pains which are taken to impress the American public with false ideas of the present situation of France. . . . The account really received . . . presents a scene dishonorable to human nature."⁴⁶ In the Centinel is expressed great sympathy for the Queen of France accused of "*impossible crimes*" by men who "affect to speak of erecting the sacred temple of law! Those which such men raise will resemble the tumuli of the Mexicans which were built with human skulls besmeared with blood."⁴⁷ The execution of Brissot and the Girondists "strikes the humane American with astonishment . . . and these were *Representatives of the People*,"⁴⁸ and moved one correspondent to cry that "*the head of a man seems to be of little more value than that of a chicken*."⁴⁹

A few examples may suffice to show the feelings of a constantly growing number of the people toward the French Revolution. Condemning the "daily shed innocent blood in France" it is found "the

(44) Mass. Spy, March 13, 1794. "A Federalist . . . must be ['according to . . . some high-flying Aristocrats'] a violent opposer of the French nation . . ." Ind. Ch., April 25, 1794.

(45) Mass. Spy, March 27, 1794.

(46) Hampshire Gazette, March 5, 1794, from the Fed. Gazette.

(47) Centinel, Jan. 25, 1794. See also a poem on the Queen by "Philemia" in *ibid.*

(48) Western Star, March 11, 1794.

(49) Centinel, Feb. 15, 1794, from the Fed. Gazette.

present French liberty..consists in an uncontrolled license to arrest, try, condemn, & execute any person who *differs in opinion* only from the ruling faction.”⁵⁰ “The cause of France” it is declared: “has been stained by excesses..for which it is not easy, if possible, to find a parallel in the history of human affairs, and from which reason and humanity recoil.”⁵¹ The leaders, Marat and Robespierre are “assassins still reeking with blood..Monsters who out do the fabled enormities of a Busiris and a Procrustus.”⁵²

It was nevertheless not so much the reports of the bloody cruelties and massacres in France which tended strongly to alienate the larger portion of the people, as the atheistical acts of the Convention and individual zealots. During the year 1793, there are some few references to this revolutionary change in France.⁵³ Danton, it is true, is spoken of as “Danton the Atheist,”⁵⁴ and the answer of sixty

(50) *Ibid.*, Feb. 12, 1794, from the *Am. Minerva*.

(51) *Ibid.*, Feb. 19, 1794, from the *Am. Daily Advertiser*.

(52) *Western Star*, March 11, 1794. In this paper there is an able and severe attack—sarcastic at times—on the bloody revolution of the various parties in France by “Cordwainer.” The series begins August 19th, and number 10 is reached by October 28th. “Has not...this divine tree [of Liberty]... been besmeared with human blood, and ingrafted with scions of Licentiousness, until it retains scarcely any resemblance of its native form?” is the truly bucolic simile used by a horrified correspondent of the *Mass. Spy*, March 20, 1794. A series runs in the *Greenfield Gazette* beginning with Sept. 18, 1794. The attitude is well illustrated from this excerpt: “In reviewing the wanton destruction of Lyons, Toulon, &c. [we see]...A Zenglis Khan...and in the revolutionary tribunal...the Duke of Alva’s ‘Council of blood’ revived.” The pitiable fate of Lyons is lamented in the *Hampshire Gazette*, Feb. 12, 1794. For other accounts see e. g. *Mass. Spy*, Oct. 15, 1794, and the *Centinel*, March 8, 1794, from the *Gazette of the U. S.* The papers for the next two years teem with accounts of the frightful occurrences. “Whoever shall read the history of the French Revolution, will chill with horrors at the different scenes of blood and havoc...” *Mass. Spy*, Jan. 14, 21, 1795. See e. g. *Western Star*, June 9, Aug. 25, 1795; *Brookfield Advertiser*, July 22, 29, 1795; *Hampshire Gazette*, July 1, 8, 1795; *Greenfield Gazette*, June 25, 1795. The same distressing news is printed the following year. Account of the “White Terror,” *Fed. Orrery*, Feb. 18, 1796. Other reports are in the *Western Star*, Feb. 2, July 26, 1796; *Mass. Spy*, Feb. 17, 1796; *Political Gazette (Newburyport)*, Feb. 2, 1796, from the *Herkimer Centinel*.

(53) “Mr. Dupont, amidst the loud applause of almost the whole Convention...declared himself to be an Atheist. The Printer thought it would sound better to make him say he was a Deist, and accordingly all our Jacobin Printers have gravely told the public that Mr. Dupont said he was a Deist.” *Centinel*, April 2, 1793.

(54) *Hampshire Gazette*, June 26, 1793.

parishes in Brittany to a proclamation of the commissioners of the Convention is printed, which contains the striking sentence: "In the name of the only true God whom you have adjured!"⁵⁵ Indeed the sitting of the club of the Cordeliers, on the 27th of July, is denounced as "a scene of horrid blasphemy and abominable wickedness, which stands unrivalled in the annals of history."⁵⁶ As early as May the Farmer's Weekly Museum announces that the French "have determined to make the experiment...that *a nation of atheists may be a moral and free people*. ...In [this]...we may discover the source of all their enormities."⁵⁷ But it was the next year which multiplied the evidences of this shocking change in France.

Sufficient evidence of this anti-religious growth which was resulting in embarrassing the friends of the French and in serving to give a formidable weapon to her opposers in America may be easily found in the Independent Chronicle during the year 1794. The former, realizing the grave danger to the friendship of the two countries, especially in New England, bent their energies, at first, to either explaining away or defending the French from this heavy charge.

The bold and injudicious decree of the Convention in changing the day of rest from the seventh to the tenth day is of course interpreted by enemies of France as the abolishing of the Sabbath and the consequent sensation was indeed profound. The report of this alarming charge is heralded January 20th, 1794,⁵⁸ and a "Frenchman" labors to remove

(55) Ibid, July 10, 1793.

(56) The quotation continues: "That sitting was wholly devoted to...the ceremonies...in transferring the cankered heart...of Marat into...that club... In this blasphemous production, our Blessed Redeemer is compared with Marat ...Christ is but a prophet, but Marat a GOD!..." Hampshire Gazette, Oct. 23, 1793. Much the same is in the Western Star, Oct. 22, 1793.

(57) May 9. See also *ibid*, May 30, 1793.

(58) *Ind. Ch.*

the unpleasant impression conveyed to the piously minded by such an impious innovation.⁵⁹ But the sentiment of Western Massachusetts is well-voiced in the Hampshire Gazette when it exclaims: "Humanity is not more shocked at the Gothic barbarities of the French, than religion at their impiety. The divine law ordaining a Sabbath once in seven days, is violated by the National Convention, who have decreed that a week shall consist of ten days."⁶⁰ A startling account of the destruction of religion with the various acts of murder, robbery and sacrilege is given in the Western Star for March 25th.⁶¹ After the details are given, it comments as follows: "May our admiration of French examples pass off without corrupting our morals or

(59) Ibid, Jan. 30, 1794. Copied by the Hampshire Gazette, March 5, 1794. The "Frenchman" begins his defense with "It has been suggested...that SUNDAY was abolished in France, and . . . this may make an unfavourable impression on the minds of many persons..." His fear was fully realized for this is one of the chief in the ever lengthening catalogue of accusations.

(60) Hampshire Gazette, Feb. 12, 1794. The Independent Chronicle hastened to print an extract (March 6, 1794) from the Philadelphia General Advertiser, which began: "THOSE who despair of seeing liberty annihilated in France, now...endeavor to prove, that the French have renounced every idea of morality and religion" and after citing the Quakers (who "refuse to use the names of the months and the days...those vestiges of Paganism...[who also] on certain festivals pursue their ordinary occupations, whilst others of us are celebrating divine service") and the Jews, makes a flat denial of the abolition of the Sabbath, by using as proof the action of the session of October, when a petition being presented "for prohibiting the celebration of Sunday the Convention passed to the order of the day, on the principle that the Constitution guaranteed the freedom of worship." The impression made by the change in the day of rest was not to be eradicated and there is a very sarcastic piece by a correspondent, even in September, on the substitution of the tenth day. Western Star, Sept. 16, 1794. And so persuaded is a correspondent of the audacity of the French that he affirms "a French Conventioner will rise and move an amendment to the Decalogue with as much assurance as he would a decree to abolish *Letters de Cachet*[sic]." Ibid. See likewise ibid, Oct. 14, 1794, quoting from a letter written from Paris. The writers in the Chronicle still keep up their losing game of seeking to explain away or soften the stubborn facts of irreligion and that paper found satisfactory evidence of a counter retort in the plan of Barrere, Dec. 6th, "for stopping the violence which in several parts of the Republic had been exercised to crush the freedom of religious worship, [which] was taken into consideration and when . . . presented . . . the following decree was made:..."

(61) The Centinel, March 22, 1794, contains a quotation from a London Paper respecting the French burial regulations "6. On the gate of this field..shall read this inscription 'Death is an everlasting sleep.'" This made quite an impression, to judge from the number of times it is quoted in papers as well as in sermons. Another unpleasant impression was made by the "dispersion of ..[the "nonjuring clergy" which] did not fail to spread the seeds of apprehension for the fate of Christianity..even to America." This is admitted by the Ind. Ch., Dec. 11, 1794.

our religious faith...It may be asked, why is this alarm in regard to our religious institutions found at this time. The answer is, because. .The infidelity, and what is more strange and shocking, the prevailing Atheism in France has not startled the American public. Such a monstrous fact is received in a manner that shows the possibility of our doing the like. Their proceedings are either applauded, or furnish matter for jesting. We smile to see silver saints coined, and we are calm when the churches are shut up, or the bibles burnt. .A body of priests, generally virtuous and learned, are slain, and we think it excellent, because they are Catholics. .Unbelievers never had so extensive examples to countenance them. .The Atheistical fanaticism of France is as ardent and as sanguinary as that of bigots or inquisitors. The only time to resist the spirit of anarchy and irreligion is in the beginning. Let it be resisted." Such solemn appeals to the conscience and religious faith of the people did not go unheeded or unanswered as the following quotation will show: "It is. .a little surprising, that. .your correspondent . .writes in favour of the politicks of a country, where the sacred institutions of Christianity have been nearly abolished, and a publick profession of Atheism, in the midst of their National Convention, received with the loudest applause."⁶² "They may . .furnish such evidence. . ["of piety or religion"] . .if anarchy is Deity. .if hecatombs of slaughtered citizens. . [are] the only acceptable sacrifices."⁶³

A month later to the assertion that religious liberty may be enjoyed in France it is retorted that "religion in France 'is liberty to withhold from. .

(62) A different and much toned down version of this episode is given in *ibid.* Dec. 11, 1794.

(63) *Mass. Spy*, April 3, 1794. "RELIGION IN FRANCE IS said to have been abolished,—and Atheism, denominated Reason, introduced in its stead!" is the disturbing announcement in the *Centinel*, May 14, 1794. There is more in the same paper, May 24.

[God] all worship, and to blaspheme his name as much as he pleases'..and those who have used it in the most licentious manner, have been the most applauded.'⁶⁴ A writer after saying: "It is objected by some, that the French are deistical and atheistical in their principles" admits that "There may probably be some foundation for these insinuations," but asserts: "This irreligion and vice, so much complained of, are not in consequence of the late Revolution, but, of that civil and ecclesiastical tyranny under which they have..groaned for so many years.'⁶⁵ A little later it is complained that "The enemies of the Republic of France..are now frequently heard declaiming on the irreligion of the French.'⁶⁶ How exceedingly weighty this accusation was proving may be inferred from another writer in the same paper, who sums up the charges made against the French, to which he severally replies, under ten heads, five of which are concerned with this irreligious and atheistical attitude of France.⁶⁷ Again it is complained: "One moment they are charged with infidelity, the next with atheism.'⁶⁸

The address of Robespierre on the 8th of May was hailed by the harrassed democrats as a complete refutation of all these accusations. One correspondent triumphantly exclaims: "To show the propriety of the remarks on the religious principles of the

(64) Mass. Spy, May 1, 1794. There are warm discussions over the irreligious actions of France in the Mass. Spy for May by "Lucius" and "M." In the Greenfield Gazette for July "Republican" and "A Son of Freedom" do battle over the same point.

(65) Ind. Ch., April 14, 1794.

(66) Ibid, May 19, 1794, from the Phila. Gazette. Yet the issue of May 26th contains such a remark as "in a great number of them [the pieces in the theatres] the Catholic religion is highly ridiculed...All the churches are converted into store houses and Temples of Reason..."

(67) Ibid, April 21, 1794.

(68) Ibid, July 17, 1794. This issue quotes the "celebrated Dr. Robertson" who said "Upon any great revolution in religion, such irregularities abound most! Thus in the first ages of the Christian church...many...broached the most extravagant opinions...In like manner after Luther's appearance..." and then makes its own application to the French Revolution.

French which have for many months past been conveyed through the Centinel [he] . . would advise the public to compare the late publication of Robertspierre. . The aristocratic junto in this country are now beat off from their hypocritical plea of *Deism* in *France*.''⁶⁹ Another likewise exults: "The British party residing among us. . Represents that religion and every virtuous principle are exploded in that Republic—That their patriots are all Deists and that the revolution in France is to destroy not only monarchy, but Religion itself. This design has had some effect upon many well disposed people in this country," and winds up: "The publication of Robertspierre. . proves that the French are influenced by the purest motives. . That they have a just sense of the SUPREME BEING, and are led to adopt the wisest and most orthodox principles of any nation in Europe.''⁷⁰ Their joy was complete with the news of "the GRAND FESTIVAL to the *Supreme Being* . . celebrated at Paris in Prairial. Yet this is the nation that is accused of atheism and irreligion,''⁷¹ and it was concluded: "the calumny of *Deism*, . . is only the desperate effort of men who sicken at their prosperity.''⁷²

The following year⁷³ is but a repetition of the last with respect to the charges and refutations of atheism in France.⁷⁴ Beginning with this year, the

(69) Ibid, July 24, 1794.

(70) Ibid, Aug. 4, 1794. The report is printed at length in *ibid*, Aug. 4, 7, 11, 14 and Sept. 4, 1794.

(71) Ibid, July 24, 1794.

(72) Ibid, Dec. 11, 1794.

(73) The attempts of the Chronicle writers to maintain their untenable position of palliating or denying French irreligion continue—as witness this example—"The friends of liberty here have in secret lamented those excesses which have attended the Revolution both of France and America. . . The reformation of Protestantism, under Luther, was not less destructive; and the cruelties and persecution which hath marked the progress of Christianity have been still more terrible." Ibid, Nov. 27, 1794.

(74) Ibid, Jan. 22; Mass. Spy, Aug. 12; and Hampshire Gazette, Nov. 11; Farmer's Weekly Museum, Nov. 24, 1795, are excellent examples of this kind of news from France. There is a very interesting quotation from the History of

party lines are being closely drawn, the clergy have taken up the battle in behalf of religion, and the federalists are trying to fasten the charge of atheism upon the democrats, both because of their defence of France and their open and constant attack upon the clergy for their political preaching.⁷⁵

Dismayed conservatives continue to marvel at the impossible attempt of the French to establish "their new government on the foundation of a merely civil and atheistical morality." Since religion is indisputably the corner stone of civil government, what confidence can be reposed in the sagacity and common sense of French political builders when they thus violate the very essential of good government? The lamentable result could be infallibly predicted. Is not France verifying at this very moment her impious attempt to overturn and defy the fundamental laws of civil polity? See

the French Revolution in the Mass. Spy, May 13, 1795: "the republican philosophers of France..were ever bigots in infidelity, the throne and the altar were equally obnoxious..many of the excesses..may be..attributed to their irreligious prejudices..beware of permitting..impious and licentious publications..there are no libels so dangerous to a state as those against God." The democrats soon had a grievance against the colleges for their activity against France. In the Western Star, (Sept. 17, 1796) is the account of the commencement at Williams College on Sept. 7th. One of the pieces is "a dialogue in French on the prevalence of infidelity in France." This is the only performance picked out for praise. Volney in his View..of the United States (on page XIX) says that prejudice against France was "encouraged even in the colleges by prizes for orations and defamatory theses against the French." In a footnote he mentions especially the prizes at "Princeton" for 1797 and 1798. See also Ind. Ch., Oct. 26, 1797.

(75) The Mass. Mercury, Nov. 20, 1795, gives a general list (from the Conn. Courant) "of the vices to which they [the democrats] are addicted: Lying, ...fraud, atheism, &c., &c." Another asserts: "[The Jacobins] with some few exceptions..are men who would destroy if they could the Constitution of Heaven, and vilify the Divine Author." The Centinel, Aug. 8, 1795, announces: "SERIOUS TRUTHS FOR THE JACOBINS. The pillars of a government are 1st, RELIGION; 2d, JUSTICE, [etc.]...1st. As to Religion, they were advocates for the irreligious sentiments of the Atheistical writers and orators in France, and apologizers for the abominable cruelties, the result of these principles, in Nantz, and in the prisons of that country. They take a particular delight in degrading Christianity, by running the comparison between the Jacobins in France, and the primitive Christians." "It is firmly believed," said the Mass. Mercury, "that were a MESSENGER OF PEACE to be sent from HEAVEN, there would be found a JACOBIN ATHEIST to vilify him.." Oct. 31, 1794. The ill name was hard to get rid of. In 1813 Mr. Bromfield wrote to Mrs. Pierson: "some of these democrats had not been into a meeting house.. for four or five years..Some of them drink two quarts of rum a day; they are very spirituous, and are in an awful state of declension." New England Magazine, N. S. II:17-18.

the miserable result and the downward steps taken with the inception of that scheme: "The human mind, loosened from religious restraints, soon became wild & extravagant, its boasted reason... intoxicated, its passions inflated, its sentiments debased, its manners brutalized, social virtue and mutual confidence were awfully subverted... Thus the detestable principles of an atheistical philosophy combining with the ferocious spirit of faction... naturally account for those tremendous scenes of carnage which have disgraced... the best cause in the world."⁷⁶ To the religiously minded New Englander a clearer case of cause and inevitable result could not be found. It was a justification of his ideas and a warning against a constantly growing innovating tendency in government and religion. Conservatism grew apace under the horrifying news from abroad and alarming signs of a moral declension at home.⁷⁷

(76) Mass. Spy, Dec. 16, 1795, from the Conn. Courant.

(77) The causes for this indigenous infidelity will be taken up in the following chapter. But it is interesting to note that so troubled were the clergy over its prevalence that at least two attributed the blame in part for its growth to their order. "There is reason to believe," said the Rev. Nathaniel Emmons, "that the late rapid increase of error and infidelity, is partly owing to the ignorance of ministers." A sermon delivered at Salem, in New Hampshire, January 4, 1797, at the Ordination of the Rev. John Smith, p. 22. See also Woodruff, H. N., Boston, 1795, p. 16.

CHAPTER VII.

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AS VIEWED BY THE CLERGY IN MASSACHUSETTS.

When Governor Hancock wrote in his proclamation for the annual fast day, April 11th, 1793, praying that the allies of the United States might be blessed and "particularly to afford his Almighty Aid to the FRENCH NATION, and still guide them into such measures as shall tend effectually to establish a government founded upon reason, justice, and the welfare of the people,"¹ he evoked a well nigh universal echo of assent from the people and likewise a heartfelt amen from the clergy. For this latter order of men were thoroughly in accord with the high hopes and fond admiration felt by practically all Americans as they watched the unfolding of a free republic on European shores. Its early events appeared to them as clearly an interference from above in the affairs of men, to hasten the coming of the Kingdom of Righteousness on earth. Surely the growth and dissemination of republicanism was a consummation devoutly to be wished and prayed for. Besides, what a compliment it was to America that this ancient kingdom should be taking over its conception of government and following the example set by the youngest of nations ! And were we not morally responsible for the results of our sowing the seeds of liberty throughout the despotisms of Europe ? Moreover, there were the treaties which bound us so closely to France. Therefore, were we not in duty bound to extend our sympathy and prayers, even if no material aid could be given ?

(1) Fed. Spy, April 2, 1793.

Very loath were the clergy to perceive the glaring and growing differences between the developments in each nation, and very much against their desires were they finally brought to openly acknowledge that there was no parallel between the two Revolutions² and to warn their hearers to have no dealings with this godless nation lest they likewise be smitten with swift judgment. But an altogether different position was maintained at first.

The general attitude of approbation flared into hot indignation and righteous anger under the spur of the news of the combination of nations against France. Generous sympathy for this beleaguered country flowed from the lips of zealous divines, as they denounced this league of the powers of darkness and regretted their inability to "sufficiently execrate the...sanguinary measures of this unjust conspiracy of kings."³ That England was foremost in this combination served but to fan the hostile feeling to white heat. Her assertion that she was defending the cause of religion was deemed the rankest hypocrisy and obtained then no credence from those who, in later times, praised England as the "bulwark of religion"⁴ and prayed for her success, lest they should be swallowed up by the all devouring Gaul.

(2) Dana, J., Ipswich, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 15.

(3) Channing, H., New London, Conn., Nov. 27, 1794, p. 14. See also Fiske, T., Cambridge, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 10; Sampson, E., Plymouth, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 13. The occasion of the celebration of the 4th of July, 1794, appeared to the Rev. Mr. Lathrop of West Springfield, a fitting opportunity to draw a parallel between the American and the French Revolutions, p. 14. See also Deane, S., Portland, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 10; Andrews, J., Newburyport, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 20; Ware, H., Hingham, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 10; Stillman, S., Boston, Nov. 20, 1794, pp. 13-16.

(4) The term "bulwark of religion" was a term of reproach greatly used by the republicans. Its currency was wide-spread during the War of 1812. Still an extract will show that it came into use by the federalists in 1798: "The present is an awful crisis...of our RELIGION..LAWS..MORALS..INDEPENDENCE. Let us earnestly beseech [God]...to make ENGLAND firm and impregnable. SHE IS NOW THE ONLY BARRIER BETWEEN US AND THE DEATHLY EMBRACES OF OUR DEAR ALLIES—between universal irreligion, immorality, and plunder, and what order, probity, virtue and religion is left among the civilized part of mankind." Western Star, Jan. 22, 1798, from the N. Y. Gazette.

With an illustration which clearly showed his feelings, the Rev. Mr. Lyman of Hatfield tartly demanded: "Do all these mighty nations of slaves draw together their armies like Gog and Magog and go up and cover the earth?"⁵ And the Rev. Samuel Spring feelingly exclaimed: "The neighboring nations are combined to pluck from her the standard of liberty. Europe is drenched with blood...O! the blood of thousands and thousands is now calling for vengeance to light upon tyrannic guilty heads."⁶ And this attitude was not at all strange. They felt, and rightly, that their success in the American Revolution was due in no small measure to the aid, secretly and openly, extended to them by France. Now was their generous ally in desperate straits, struggling not only for liberty and the rights of man, but for existence itself.

Not only was this "unholy alliance" vigorously denounced, but in some instances genuine apprehension proclaimed the fear that "if the confederated kings should effect the conquest of France; may they not, with as fair a pretext; and will they not, with as warm a zeal direct their power against the American states...?"⁷ And another clergyman was convinced that "Among other causes, under heaven, of

(5) Hatfield, Nov. 7, 1793, p. 17.

(6) Newburyport, Nov. 7, 1793, p. 12.

(7) Lathrop, J., West Springfield, July 4, 1794. The next year Mr. Lathrop was of the same persuasion, although his convictions altered with rapidity after this. In a sermon, Feb. 19th, 1795, at West Springfield, he puts the case more strongly and prophesies: "If she [France] should ultimately fail in the conflict, we shall have cause to tremble for ourselves. To her successes, as the immediate cause, we are clearly to impute the continuence of our tranquillity..." p. 12. See also Piske, R., Cambridge, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 10; Emerson, W., Harvard College, July 4, 1794, p. 15; Bradford, E., Rowley, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 8. On the other hand there were a few of the clergy—and their company became soon largely increased—who saw in the revolution which took place in Geneva a sinister warning and practical demonstration of what would befall America if France were too successful. A book called the *Authentic History of the Origin and Progress of the late Revolution in Geneva* was quoted in some sermons. See e. g. Holmes, A., Cambridge, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 23, and footnote: "Geneva...has recently lost...[her liberty] through the base intrigues of a French democratical faction [which]...has added impiety to cruelty and sacrilege to anarchical tyranny." See also Tappen, D., Cambridge, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 18, foot note. The democrats were naturally greatly displeased. See Ind. Ch., March 26, April 3, 1795. See also p. 132, n. 57; p. 131, n. 53.

our present tranquillity we may reckon the success of the arms of the Republic of France, as one of the most important.”⁸ In the partition of Poland these alarmists perceived the fate in store for America, should this “horrid and infamous” league prevail over France. Hence, not only as an example of barbarous and cruel treatment, was the unhappy fate of Poland dwelt upon by fervid divines, but as a solemn warning to America.⁹

Some of the clergy, indeed, found a stumbling block in the numerous reports of the horrors attending the progress of the Revolution.¹⁰ Others comforted themselves with the idea that the enormities of every kind, which had taken place in France, were but the natural reactions of men who had had their shackles of political as well as ecclesiastical bondage suddenly loosened with the inevitable result of temporary excesses and that in time license would give way to real liberty and atheism would be replaced with the true and purified religion.¹¹ Such was the Rev. Joseph McKeen’s opinion. On April 11th, 1793, at Beverly, he advanced the belief that “though we may indulge a hope that the revolutions of the present day will eventually be productive of good to Zion, their first effects will probably be of a contrary nature. It will not be strange if, in

(8) Thatcher, T., Dedham, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 18. Such sentiments were zealously propagated in the republican newspapers. See e. g. Ind. Ch., Jan. 27, 1794.

(9) See e. g. Fiske, T., Cambridge, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 10. Many a “tear” was “dropped” over Poland’s fate. Deane, S., Portland, [Me.], Feb. 19, 1795, p. 17; Barnard, T., Salem, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 20; Wadsworth, B., Danvers, Feb. 19, 1795. Although the last was broad enough to impartially “drop a tear over Poland, Geneva, and the contending nations in general.” p. 22.

(10) Mellen, J., Barnstable, Nov. 20, 1794, pp. 19-20; Wadsworth, B., Danvers, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 26.

(11) There were those clergymen, well disposed towards France, who found difficulty in reconciling approbation of the French Revolution with not only its bloody excesses, but with its strongly marked atheistical tendencies and acts. The Rev. Ezra Sampson, however, (in a note on page 13 of his discourse delivered February 19, 1795) points out that “An entire approbation of the original principles of the French Revolution is very consistent with a just abhorrence of those ferocious and bloody measures.” The consensus of opinion at this time may be well summed up: “The French Revolution then may be of God..although conducted by infidels, and disgraced by outrages which nothing can justify.” Bicheno, J., The Signs of the Times.. Providence, 1794, p. 9.

the progress of these revolutions, the grossest infidelity, impiety and vice should spread for a time like an overflowing flood.’¹²

There were still others who at first saw nothing strange or alarming in the irreligious actions of the Revolution. The Rev. Jedidiah Morse, who completely changed his opinion shortly afterwards, comfortingly remarked: “The rejection of the Christian Religion in France is less to be wondered at, when we consider in how unamiable and disgusting a point of view it has been there exhibited under the hierarchy of Rome. When peace and a free government shall be established...we anticipate...a glorious revival and prevalence of pure, unadulterated Christianity.’¹³

Among a few of the more sanguine, there welled up a hope that a change was taking place in France since “Of late there are plain symptoms of a better direction granted to that people at which every one should rejoice.”¹⁴ And it was believed that “Since [Robespierre’s] fall, the affairs of France...have assumed a new and more pleasing aspect. They begin to acknowledge the being and providence of God, and to inculcate the principles of religion and the rules of morality.”¹⁵ Great pleasure, though the words “at present” seem to make the “pleasure” somewhat temporary, was evinced by the Rev.

(12) p. 12.

(13) p. 14., Feb. 19, 1795, And the Rev. Mr. Wadsworth while he exclaimed “Humanity revolts to patronize all their [French] proceedings” yet concludes that “Considering how apt the human mind is to fly from one extreme to another, it is not strange, that infidelity should at first succeed superstition. But,” he added, “cool reason and sober argument will in time correct the error and settle the judgment in religion.” Danvers, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 27. See also Ware, H., Hingham, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 22; Thatcher, T. C., Lynn, Nov. 20, 1794, p. 14; Frisbie, T., Ipswich, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 17; Lathrop, J., West Springfield, July 4, 1794, p. 11.

(14) Dana, J. Ipswich, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 15. This reluctance to denounce France and to persist in seeing the bright side of the developments in France is very typical of many of the sermons of this year. Despite the striking differences between the progress of the revolution in the two countries the clergy—many of them—shut their eyes and refused to believe the plain evidence. They clung tenaciously to the belief that the few drops of blood bespattering the garments of Liberty in France ought in no wise to alienate or frighten America.

(15) Fiske, T., Cambridge, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 18.

Samuel West "that a candid spirit prevails at present in the French Republic."¹⁶

But the Rev. Mr. Eliot sounds a note of pessimism, when he adds a footnote to his sermon of November 20th, containing the remark that "It seems the philosophers and statesmen are *now* countenancing the belief of a God and a future state; and perhaps may see the necessity of recurring to some Christian institutions, which they have set aside. In this they ought not to be commended, however we may admire their zeal in the cause of freedom."¹⁷ But the Rev. Mr. Ware is still thoroughly loyal, for he asserts: "And as we lamented the excesses which, till lately, disgraced the glorious cause in which France was engaged; and as much as we detested the sanguinary measures pursued by a faction within her; the American people have wished well to the cause of the French, through every stage of the revolution."¹⁸

Another feature of the Revolution, which strongly appealed to certain of the narrow-minded clergy, was the heavy blows the French were supposed to be dealing to the Catholic church.¹⁹ Their bigotry

(16) Boston, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 19.

(17) 1794, p. 15. His latter sentence is obscure, but he evidently means their general atheistical actions "ought not to be commended."

(18) Hingham, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 10. In his Thanksgiving sermon of Feb. 19, 1795, Rev. Mr. Story is moved to say that "When we contemplate the manner in which their Queen was butchered, and her royal Consort..and consider their treatment of the noble [Lafayette]..[we must] lament..that the noblest cause..has been polluted by atrocities so detestible." See likewise Channing, H., New London, Conn., Nov. 27, 1794, p. 14. The Rev Mr. Sampson held that "the French people themselves do now execrate some of those enormities, and are willing to consign the authors to eternal infamy.." Plympton, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 13, foot note. See also Tappan, D., Cambridge, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 22, foot note; Kendal, S., Weston, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 11. He attributes all the excesses of the French to the Jacobins. However the Rev. Mr. Gillet is convinced that "were it not for the hopeful attainment of a national system..the frequent domestic broils, and wanton slaughter..were more distressful..that the unbounded reign of Louis XVI; and all the horrors of the late Bastille." Hallowell, [Me.] Nov. 19, 1795, p. 18.

(19) Bradford, A., Two Sermons upon..the Kingdom of Christ, delivered..in Cambridge, December 28, 1794, pp. 22-5; Thatcher, T. C., Lynn, Nov. 20, 1794, p. 13; Rev. Mr. Samuel Stillman thus consoles himself in regard to the shocking change in the "divinely appointed Sabbath:" "this strange circumstance..will be overruled for good. Is it not reasonable to suppose, that it will tend to obliterate from the minds of the people, especially children and youth, every

was only equaled by their short sightedness, for the events, over which they rejoiced in such unchristian fashion, were destructive of all religion, a fact which even to the most intolerant became more and more apparent as time went on.

As among the people, so among the clergy, there soon began to arise—with the years 1793 and 1794—sceptics and doubters, who separated themselves from the universal throng of believers in and adherents of the French Revolution.²⁰ This movement grew apace from 1793 to 1796 and by 1797 and 1798 there was hardly a minister who did not violently execrate the French and their Revolution,²¹ since both country and religion were in danger. This complete change in sentiment was largely accomplished by the close of 1795 and fully consummated by 1796. The ardent political activity in the pulpit and outside, which was vigorously maintained until after the War of 1812, was due to several causes, all hinging on the French Revolution and its after-math.

At the time that the Constitution was proposed, the clergy were warmly in its favor and active in

idea of saints days, feasts and fasts, &c., which make a great part of the superstition of the Romish church?" Boston, Nov. 20, 1794, p. 20; see also p. 13, and Mellen, J., Hanover, Feb. 19, 1795, pp. 6-7. The Rev. John McKnight of New York, whose sermon was accused by the federalists of being "a dish of jumbled politics collected from one side of the news only" admits that "infidelity the natural offspring of [Catholicism]..has boldly reared its hideous front [in France]..and everywhere stalked in open day." Feb. 19, 1795, p. 18. And the news of the suppression of the Papal Power by the orders of Napoleon on Feb. 15th, 1798 was received with exceeding great joy by the clergy as fulfilling the prophecy made in the 17th chapter of Revelations, and the verse which to them unmistakably described the event was the 16th. The Rev. John Thayer, a convert to Catholicism and the priest at Boston, was highly displeased with this evidence of illiberality. In his sermon on the 9th of May, 1798, he very justly complains of the abusive attacks on the Pope and remarks that "Dr. Belknap..After 'about twenty years of attentive contemplation, with the best helps,' has at length made the ludicrous discovery that the.. pope is doubtless a beast and a whore."

(20) As early as 1793 it was admitted that "Hence in their pursuit of.. equal liberty and a free government, we have heard of many follies and excesses, which a people accustomed to freedom would have readily avoided." Lyman, J., Hatfield, Nov. 7, 1793, pp. 15-16. Soon caution and reproof were given to the French by even the clergy who were still well disposed towards France. See Baldwin, T., Boston, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 21; Andrews, J., Newburyport, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 20.

(21) Weston, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 19.

securing its adoption in Massachusetts. Impressed with the benefits and blessings to the country derived from the operation of the federal government,²² they had been loud in their praises and openly disposed to lend their aid in its support.²³ No order of men had suffered more from the Revolution or the disorders attending Shays' Rebellion, and they clearly perceived the danger to religion in such unsettled times. Starting with this strong federalistic foundation, they cherished an unbounded affection and admiration for the President, which they did not hesitate to express on all occasions.²⁴

Such remarks engendered nothing but general approbation from the congregations and the wider audiences which eagerly read the printed sermons. But when the speakers began on the Whiskey Rebellion and its alleged cause, democratic susceptibilities were immediately aroused. The Democratic Societies, born of an attempt to organize the common people against the powerful influence of the federalist leaders, had had to meet fierce opposition

(22) Osgood, D., *The Wonderful Works of God.*, Medford, Nov. 20, 1794, *passim*; Deane, S., Portland, [Me.] Feb. 19, 1795, p. 17; Frisbie, L., Ipswich, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 13.

(23) A "Hamiltonian" contempt for the people was characteristic of some of the clergy. Among these was David Osgood, who rebuked the heresy of the people's attempt to participate in their own government as follows (Medford, Nov. 19, 1795, p. 31): "They [e. g. those who had made themselves obnoxious to the federalists by their anti-treaty meetings and manifestations] may know enough of the places and stations which Providence hath assigned them; may be good and worthy members of the community, provided they would be content to move in their own sphere, and not meddle with things too high for them. Not being the eyes, ears or tongue of the body, they are monstrously disorderly when they presume to exercise the office of these organs." Gardner F., Leominster, Nov. 19, 1795: "Now it is certain that there are but few who are competent judges of the matter ["Conduct of the government of the United States, in the measures which they have taken to prevent war..."]. This is one of those things that the great body of the people must refer to their rulers, and be contented not to have a clear knowledge of it themselves." p. 19. See Rev. J. Bird's contemptuous reference to "the Demo's in this town!" in the advertisement to his Discourse...in Saybrook [and Berlin, Conn., April 7, 1800.] April 4. A. D., 1803.

(24) To these eulogies of their President, the people to their honor be it said, fully responded, and later those shameful attacks in the Philadelphia Aurora and other democratic sheets, elicited little or no support in Massachusetts. And even a decade after death, the formation of the Washington Benevolent Societies, however purely political their aims, shows the reverence and affection for that "great and good man" to be as strong as ever. The opinion of the Rev. Samuel Austin is a fair sample: "THE Man, the rich gift of a

and contumely from thoroughly aroused conservatives and federalists. But it was when overpowered by the charge, officially made by Washington, that they were fomenters of the Whiskey Rebellion, that the burden of successful defence became too much for the discredited organizations. In the assaults upon these "self-created societies" some of the clergy took a prominent part.²⁵

merciful God to the Republic..The amiable, the respectable, the never to be forgotten WASHINGTON..[is] one of the most conspicuous memorials to the Divine mercy." Worcester, Dec. 15, 1796, p. 6. See also Andrews, J., Newburyport, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 18; Tappan, D., Charlestown, April 11, 1793, p. 20. These are but samples of the unanimous attitude of the clergy. Madison writes to E. Pendleton, Phila., Feb. 7, 1796; Works, II:78: "the name of the President is everywhere used with wonderful success, by the Treaty partizans.. Nowhere has this policy been exerted with so much effect as in New England.." Same to Jefferson, May 9, 1796; Works, II:100-1: "The N. England States have been ready to rise en mass against the H. of Rep..The people..have..listened to the summons 'to follow where Washington leads.'" Doubtless as the Salem Gazette (Feb. 17, 1797) remarked, his visit had "conquered the prejudices of many." The democratic opposition to Washington but increased federalist affection (and in this respect all the inhabitants of New England except for the Boston democrats were unanimous) one such remarking: "I doubt not..if an Herodia's daughter would dance *Ca ira*.. to please [the Jacobins]..they would make the President a head shorter.." Ibid. The political zeal led these worshippers of Washington to certain excesses such as "At Ipswich was celebrated THE Political Chris'mas of our country," one of the toasts being "GEORGE WASHINGTON: May his calumniators be forgiven, 'for they know not what they do.'" Fed. Orrery, March 3, 1796. The announcement of the celebration of Washington's Birthday was introduced as follows: "Yesterday..A discharge of cannon welcomed in the anniversary of the blessed morn which gave to America a political Saviour and Protector. Flags were displayed [everywhere]..and almost continual discharges of *feurs des joys*, was kept up during the day, huzzas and shouts jubilant rent the air and from the mouth of even the atheist was heard the..prayer for the long continuence of a life so precious." Ibid, Feb. 23, 1796. This extravagance naturally laid the federalists open to the charge of "blasphemy" which the republicans immediately brought up. See Ind. Ch., Jan. 2, 1797. See the attack in *ibid* (Feb. 28, 1799) on the Federalist toast "THE DAY—The anniversary of the most important event that ever blessed the world." Those who tried to celebrate Washington's Birthday found difficulty in ascertaining the correct date. Thus, the first time, Feb. 11th, was chosen. Centinel, Feb. 16, 1788. In 1791 a celebration was held in Boston, February 11th, with cannon, bunting and a dinner. S. Breck to Knox, Boston, Feb. 16, 1791; Knox MSS. XXVII:140. Breck writes to Knox, on Jan. 16, 1791: (Knox MSS. XXVII:116) "last year we celebrated the 11th of Feb. as the President's birthday, but we have been told, that is not the proper day, as we intend to Feast this year on the same occasion, I wish you to inform me (by the return of the post.)" They dined, however, on the 11th and Breck paid for "82 Bottles of Madeira," which was 30 more than the year before.

(25) Dr. Osgood's sermons of Nov. 20th, 1794, and Feb. 19th, 1795, are chiefly concerned with these "pestilential" societies. Certain of the clergy looked upon "Such combinations of men in a republic..[as] very pernicious," (Packard, H., Boston, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 18,) and considered "the popular societies" as "Equally unfriendly to a continuance of liberty and equal rights" since "they constitute a dangerous aristocracy" (Ward, H., Feb. 19, 1795, p. 27. See also p. 14), and the Rev. Joseph Dana is convinced that "Among those things which have produced such infelicitities in France; darkened its fair prospects.. near to ruin..is plainly volunteers in politics 'speaking louder' than the constituted authorities;" Ipswich, Feb. 19, 1795, pp. 23-4. See also Andrews, J.,

Now, these clubs were the direct offspring of the French Revolution. The parent societies were charged with being directly responsible for bringing about that great upheaval. They were, moreover, accused of leading in the terrible slaughters and murders which were rapidly shaking the faith of many in the righteousness of the French cause.²⁶ That these first fruits of Jacobin sowing were reaping an evil harvest in the Whiskey Rebellion was only too apparent. If these "meddling busy bodies" could thus quickly excite an uprising, even on so small a scale, what but a French Revolution would be enacted in this country if time were only given them to exercise their peculiar and dangerous talents.²⁷ And the cost of the suppression of that seditious insurrection was a great grief. The heart-rending waste of \$2,000,000 was continually harped upon in newspaper and sermon in New England. Few arguments could strike home more effectually.²⁸ Hence it was concluded and set forth plainly from the pulpits that these associations were dangerous, turbulent, mis-

Newburyport, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 19; Kendal, S., Weston, Feb. 19, 1795, pp. 28-30, on p. 23, footnote he quotes 2 Peter II. regarding "cursed children;" Channing, H., New London, Conn., Nov. 27, 1794, p. 21; Deane, S., Portland [Me.], Feb. 19, 1795, p. 18; esp. Osgood, D., Medford, Nov. 19, 1795, pp. 28-9; Sampson, E., Plympton, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 20; Tappan, D., Cambridge, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 25, foot note. The only clergyman who defended and eulogized these "pestilential disorganizing" clubs was Ebenezer Bradford. In his famous sermon of February 19th, 1795, at Rowley, he cries out: "Therefore all the true Sons of Liberty, will be naturally led, to say unto all the Democratic Societies, both in France and America, Health & Fraternity." p. 18. On the previous page he declared that "Power, honour, popularity, and even Hell itself have been ransacked in vain, for language and malice to blast these associations."

(26) Osgood, D., Medford, Nov. 20, 1794, pp. 23-4.

(27) *Ibid.*, p. 24.

(28) The attitude of New England is betrayed by the following two quotations: "In some instances the .grants [of Congress] .are beyond the expectations of the people, in this part of the United States. .however, the good people will. .consider this as the effect of the difference of habits. .that what here would be considered profusion, would in other places be termed parsimony." *Centinel*, Aug. 28, 1790. And likewise the following from *ibid.*, Oct. 4, 1794:

"1. This is the book of the generation and downfall of Jacobinism.

"2. Brissot begat the Jacobin Club of Paris—The Jacobin Clubs of Paris begat Genet, and his French Brethren.

"3. Genet begat the Democratic Societies in America; The Democratic Societies begat the Pittsburg Rebellion, and its consequences.

"4. The Pittsburg Rebellion begat an armament of 15,000 men.

"5. The Armament of fifteen thousand men, will beget an expense of near Two Million of dollars; for which all the people of the United States must bear a proportion.

chief breeding, secret to boot and the real aristocracies in the land.²⁹

The terrible excesses, in an age which counted a public execution as a holiday, were such as to give a shiver to the warmest zeal of even the most Jacobinized American. And the report of the multitudinous examples of inhumanity rudely shook the belief of the clergy in the cause of the French and their faith that even "the end was good" began to turn to unbelief.³⁰ But what operated most powerfully on the minds of the clergy were vivid accounts of the alarming prevalence of universal atheism and the official attacks on Christianity.³¹ Enthusiasm for the high-sounding principles of the French Revolution did not blind a goodly portion of the clergy to the serious state of religion in France, nor to the fact that the destruction of the Catholic religion portended, not only the destruction of all religion there, but elsewhere, just as far as the influence of the French Revolution extended. This latter danger was not, however, at first perceived. Nevertheless, the dismal condition of religion and morality startled the ministers and made them think far less favorably

"6. The expense will beget an attention in the people, to its rise and origin, and,

"7. That attention will beget the detestation and downfall of Jacobinism and its Clubs.

8. So all the generations, from Brissot to the downfall of Jacobinism, are eight generations."

(29) The Rev. David Tappan said significantly: "The spirit of popular, aristocratic...despotism, has cruelly oppressed [France]...under the form and pretensions of high democratic freedom. An uninformed and furious population, intoxicated with undigested notions of its own sovereignty for a long time [has reigned]..." pp. 22-3, foot note, Cambridge, Feb. 19, 1795.

(30) "Deceiving and deceived, oppressing and oppressed, abandoned to rapine and violence, to blood and slaughter; they will continue to bite and devour till they are consumed one of another." Osgood, D., Medford, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 28.

(31) Besides the newspaper accounts of the prevalent atheism in France books and pamphlets were circulated describing the alarming condition. Considerations on religion...with remarks on the speech of M. Dupont, delivered in the National Convention of France by Hannah Moore was first printed in Boston in 1794. The speech was on December 14th, 1792, and contains the striking exclamation, "What! Thrones are overturned!...And yet the Altars of God remain!...For myself...I am an atheist!" See also Moore's Journal in France; Farmer's Weekly Museum, June 23, 1795. The Letters from France (published in two volumes, Phila., 1796.) by Helen Maria Williams, an eye-witness

of the Revolution than before.³² The sorry state of the French people is thus described by horror-struck divines: "Considering death eternal sleep, and rejecting the belief of God and every religious principle, they let the people loose from every restraint, and prepared them for every species of injustice, wickedness and abomination...what unjust executions! What horrid massacres!"³³ "The genius of piety and of order laments that boasting infidelity and irreligion; that tumultuous and ferocious anarchy which...have veiled the lustre, and retarded the progress of liberty;"³⁴ "it is certain that a very considerable proportion of the nation have exploded all religion, and, in some of their most public and solemn acts, their government has virtually rejected the doctrine of a God governing the world by his providence."³⁵ "It is a melancholy consideration, that statesmen and legislators [in France]...should

having been imprisoned there, was quoted as much as any book in the newspapers. See e. g. Hampshire Gazette, Nov. 11, 18, 1795; March 9, 1796; Centinel, Nov. 4, 1795; Mass. Spy, March 9, 1796. The Revolution in France by Noah Webster was quoted by the clergy. See e. g. David Osgood's approval of it as "judicious and instructive" in his sermon of Nov. 20th, 1794. Later there were numerous books which the clergy referred to. The Cannibal's Progress, by Anthony Aufer, Esq; [Newburyport, n. d.] quoted also in the Pol. Repository, Oct. 2, 1798. J. Mallet Du Pan: History of the Destruction of the Helvetic Union and Liberty (this "ought to be read by every American" is the Rev. Manassah Cutler's opinion). Another book of his was The Dangers which threaten Europe... N. Y., 1795. Others used were Abbé Burruel: History of the French Clergy; The Inside View of the Prisons of Paris; The Cruelties of the Jacobins; John Gifford: Letter to Thomas Erskine, containing some Strictures on his View of the Cause and Consequences of the present War in France, quoted in the Salem Gazette, Dec. 8, 1796, from the N. Y. Gazette. The Siege of Lyons, published in Philadelphia, 1795, was another book much referred to by the clergy as well as the newspapers. See e. g. Farmer's Weekly Museum, June 30; July 7, 1795; Greenfield Gazette, June 25, 1795; Hampshire Gazette, July 1, 8, 1795; Brookfield Advertiser, July 22, 29, 1795. Among other books used by the clergy were The Banditti Unmasked, by "Gen. Daneau, a Frenchman," Newburyport Herald, May 8, 1798; Pirie: Lectures, and his Antisocial Conspiracy. See also History of the Armies of the French Revolution. Salem Gazette, Sept. 29; Oct. 24, 1797, and The Crimes Committed during the French Revolution. Mass Spy, Sept. 20, 1797.

(32) "When I first read Mr. Necker's treatise on the importance of religious opinions, I doubted of the occasion for so much labour.. But the subsequent events among [those]..people..have shown, that he had sufficient reason for urging the whole force of the argument." Osgood, D., Medford, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 26.

(33) Fiske, T., Cambridge, Feb. 19, 1795: "Liberated from the shackles of the grossest superstition, it might have been expected, that the French would have fallen into the other extreme, and become religious enthusiasts. But that the leaders should reject all religion..may well excite astonishment.." p. 17.

(34) Tappan, D., Charlestown. Feb. 19, 1795, p. 27.

(35) Ware, H., Hingham, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 22.

have been distinguished for opinions which shock the reason of men, and would disgrace the understanding of an Hottentot.”³⁶ “In [France]...we have seen the apostles of atheism more fanatical than the disciples of Omar...and more bloody than the votaries of Moloch... Blaspheming...God, have they not consecrated their impious temples dedicated to a false and misguided reason with hecatombs of human victims?”³⁷ “It is astonishing that some serious men among ourselves, and ministers of the gospel, should excuse this [atheism], on account of the superstitions of the church of Rome. But what should we think of physicians who, to cure a disease, administered poison?”³⁸ The unhappy case of France might be—and indeed was—regarded rather complacently at first as a temporary incident of so great an upheaval and to these vigorous Puritans as also a natural reaction against the “superstitions” of the “Romish religion” were it not for two facts which could not be overlooked. One was that ever since the American Revolution there had existed not only a marked indifference to religion, but an actual and noticeable tendency toward irreligion and deism if not downright atheism.³⁹ And, secondly, the evidence accumulated rapidly that the

(36) Osgood, D., Medford, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 28.

(37) Smith, S. S., Philadelphia, Feb. 19, 1795. Printed entirely with notes in the Hampshire Gazette, March 25, April 1, 1795.

(38) Elliot, J., Boston, Nov. 20, 1794, p. 15, foot note. See also Emmons, N., Franklin, Dec. 15, 1796, p. 10; Barnard, T., Harvard College, Sept. 3, 1795, pp. 23-4; Barnes, D., Hingham, (also in Scituate) April 5, 1795, p. 16. The Rev. Samuel Stillman of Boston, who is inclined in 1794 to look with favor on the French Revolution, says in his Thanksgiving sermon, November 20th of that year: “We highly applaud the[ir] principles. But we censure and lament... their rejection of religion.” p. 12.

(39) Indeed the irreligious conditions in the colleges, e. g. at Yale, were very marked, so much so that “When in 1795 Dwight entered...the presidency nearly all of the members of...[the senior] class had jocularly assumed the name of the leading infidels of the eighteenth century.” Taylor, M. C. *Three Men of Letters*, p. 110. The President, however, soon wrought a total transformation. As for Harvard, matters were not better. W. E. Channing, who entered in 1794 says: “College was never in a worse state...The French Revolution had diseased the imagination and unsettled the understanding of men everywhere...the authority of the past was gone...the tone of books and conversation was presumptuous and daring. The tendency of all classes was to skepticism” *Memoir of W. E. Channing*, I:70.

French Revolution was directly and indirectly a powerful agency for increasing this alarming drift towards perdition. Partly owing to the natural tendency of Americans, through blind enthusiasm, to copy everything French, both good and bad, but chiefly due to the zealous circulation of French infidel tracts and books and to the increasing immigration of these active "agents of Satan" the religious character of America was becoming radically revolutionized.⁴⁰ Therefore, both as ministers of the gospel and good citizens, for to them religion was the

(40) A note in Knox's handwriting among his letters (in the Knox MSS. XLII:20) says: "Mr. Volney, when in Boston in the Spring of '97, expressed himself gratified at the progress of the spirit of the French revolution. England said he will be revolutionized the same spirit will run through Italy..and indeed throughout all the civilized part of Europe and then says he with the highest exultation they will put Christianity behind their backs.'" It is recorded in Scudder's *Life of Noah Webster* (p. 130.) that a single conversation with Genet was sufficient to turn him from a puritan to a vigorous opponent of the French Revolution. The speedy change was very possibly due to the anti-religious sentiments expressed by the French Minister, for Webster in his pamphlet: *The Revolution in France Considered in Respect to its Progress and Effects*, [N. Y., 1794.] spends seventeen and a half pages (out of 45 pages) considering the dismal state of religion and morality there. The logic of the New England clergy was simple, but it was most irrefutably complete in their eyes. An outline is as follows: America has supplanted Judea as the country God considers peculiarly His own, New England being especially that portion of the United States which is—as it ought to be—blessed above all by Divine approval. At this present moment the French, besides their actual physical warfare, seek by their atheistical influences, tracts and agents to separate this country from the Divine favor and protection and therefore to destroy it (as the Jewish nation was for its sins) morally as well as actually. The reasoning is very clearly brought out in the sermon of (e. g.) Joseph Sumner, Shrewsbury, Nov. 28, 1799, p. 16. Neither is this extravagant opinion of New England's superiority in all lines uncommon. The following is by no means unique. T. Dwight to O. Wolcott, Hartford, May 25, 1793, Wolcott Mss., Conn. Hist. Soc.: "not only young gentlemen from our Sister States, but from every quarter of this globe would do well to pass a few years of their life among us, & acquire our habits of thinking and living. Half a dozen legislators or even scholars bred in New England & dispersed thro the different countries of Europe every year, would in half an age change the political face of affairs in the Old World."

"For the honor of our country," exclaimed Rev. Daniel Dana, (Newburyport, April 25, 1799), "we must presume, that an enemy—an enemy that walks in darkness—has taken advantage of our slumbers to sow these pernicious tares." p. 45. The Age of Reason "was..conveyed at a single time into our country, in order to be sold at a cheap rate, or given away..What baneful success has attended this vile and insidious effort, you [well know.]" p. 46. The same language is held by Rev. Jedidiah Morse (Nov. 29, 1798, p. 74.) "The Age of Reason..written in France (.it is said in the house, and under the patronage of Mr. Munroe), printed there in the English language, and a cargo of fifteen thousand copies, at one time sent [here and sold cheaply]...or given away. The effects..by..these books, and others of the same cast..[are] evident..and [deplorable.]" His appendix to this sermon announces that it "exhibit[s]..proofs of the early existence, progress and deleterious effects of French intrigue and influence in the United States." (49 pages are in the appendix, 39 in the sermon.) See also Wilder, J., Attleborough, May 9, 1798, p. 12; Taylor, J., Deerfield, Nov. 29, 1798, p. 11. "In consequence of their example, and writings, infidelity and impiety, had assumed a boldness unknown before..The..gospel began

foundation and backbone of civil polity, they girded up their loins, put on their armor and fought a good fight, as it seemed to them, for their God and their Country.

To begin with, the clergy were in an exceedingly dissatisfied frame of mind with the state of religion in Massachusetts. Even before the Revolution, disquieting tendencies had developed.⁴¹ The writer of the Ecclesiastical History of Essex County (North), and there is no reason to think it exceptional for the well settled portions of Massachusetts, draws a melancholy picture of religious stagnation: "The *first decade*, from 1761 to 1771, was a time when our Zion had reason to mourn... The *second decade*, from 1771 to 1781, was, like the preceding period, a time of political excitement and spiritual declension... the additions to the churches were very few. But they were fewer still during the *third decade*... from 1781 to 1791... In respect to growth this was the

to be ridiculed... Christianity to be treated, as injurious to the liberty and happiness of men, having originated in ignorance, priestcraft and fanaticism. Such as had been previously tainted with scepticism, now gloried in the example of a great nation, practically declaring their unbelief. Multitudes... [in Europe asserted] that tyranny and misery were the legitimate offspring of the Christian system. Such examples, when every heart beat with joy, at the successes of the French, could not fail of producing unhappy effects, upon the public mind. In addition... a number of distinguished characters in America, threw off the mask of hypocrisy, and shamefully abetted the cause of infidelity..." Practically all the sermons of 1798 and 1799 agree in this conviction of the studied attempts of the French to be "a committee of insurrection for all the world" and to overturn our government, liberty and religion by propagating these "diabolical principles of atheism."

(41) The Centinel early notices the decline of religion: "A too general indifference in religious practise, and a much greater carelessness, as to religious tenets has taken place. Ministers of different denominations are contending with each other—Congregationalists... are crumbling into an infinite number of parties. They are daily, (as usual) quarreling with, and dismissing their ministers; reviling and ruining them. As total a disunion has seized upon this body in New England, as their most inveterate opposers can desire." Feb. 19, 1791. See also the Farmer's Weekly Museum, Dec. 27, 1793; July 25, 1794. The democrats were wholly convinced that the growth of infidelity was to be traced to the quarrels of the clergy and indeed it was John Adams' disgust with their endless divisions and animosities which dissuaded him from entering the ministry. In a pamphlet called A View of the New England Illuminati... [i. e., the clergy] the writer says: "Before the beginning of the revolution in France, they were chiefly devoted, after the late war to polemic divinity and ecclesiastical controversies. From hence arose, in those states, a strong propensity to deism and scepticism... many of the laity were prepared to attend to deistical writings; and philosophy and liberality became very fashionable." p. 5. But the federalists attributed it to the influence and example of France as well as the Age of Reason. See Farmer's Weekly Museum, Feb. 3, 1795, from the Conn. Courant.

darkest period in the whole history of these churches..”⁴² The American Revolution had had a very unfortunate effect on public morality, since it “opened a flood gate of iniquity. The robbery of privateering—the vices of foreign armies and adventurers...together with the frauds of a depreciating paper currency, concurred with the almost necessary neglect of religious institutions to corrupt the people.”⁴³

So marked was the people’s wide departure from the standards of their ancestors, that Governor Bowdoin felt called upon, in 1785, to issue a Proclamation for “Inculcating Piety and Virtue”⁴⁴ This does not seem to have had more than a temporary effect. The limitation of the “Puritan” Sabbath to eighteen hours by the legislature, after a strong protest by the rural members, was a dreadful indication to many pious persons of the dreary decay of religion and morality.⁴⁵ The conservatives saw in the introduction of the theatre into Boston, to which they offered a vigorous but finally unsuccessful opposition, a horrible breeder of vice and immor-

(42) Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of Essex County, pp. 251-2. “But the fact is, that while twelve new churches of our order were formed between 1700 and 1750, only three such churches were formed between 1750 and 1800. Nor can this disparity be accounted for by the greater encroachment of other denominations, during the latter of the two periods, for they had just the same number of churches formed, viz., two, in each period.” p. 249.

(43) Western Star, May 12, 1795, from the Eastern Herald (Portland). Extract from a late Thanksgiving sermon. See also the Salem Gazette, March 17, 1797.

(44) The Proclamation was issued on June 8th, 1785. It is given in the Am. Herald, June 20, 1785. The whole title was a “Proclamation for the Encouragement of Piety, Virtue, Education and Manners, and the Suppression of Vice.” One enthusiast wrote: “you cannot conceive the happy effect the good proclamation has had on the pious people in your neighborhood, especially those in authority. The vigilance of the wardens in Roxbury last Sunday, is truly worthy of remark. Instead of hundreds of carriages that used to pass to and from Boston, not one passed the line. Our justice of the peace, that has not darkened the doors of our sanctum for these six months, was yesterday escorted thither by our wardens.” Ibid, July 25, 1785. Eastern Massachusetts, however, would not return to the old Puritan days for by August 17th, 1785, the Centinel announced that “Unsupported by our magistrates, frowned upon by the thoughtless, abused and insulted by the lawless and licentious, the wardens of Roxbury retreated from their posts.” S. Shaw to Knox, Boston, Aug. 8, 1785. Knox MSS. XVIII:67: “For the past two or three weeks there have been something like hostilities between [Boston].. and..Roxbury. The [latter] ..stopped and actually prosecuted a number of Bostonians for riding out on the Lord’s day.”

(45) Braintree e. g. severely rebuked this act of the legislature. Adams, Three Episodes of Mass. Hist., II:894-5.

ality,⁴⁶ while the clergy found the increased amount of unnecessary travelling on Sunday, teaming on the Lord's day, and even the practice noticed here and there of walking out in the country on the Sabbath, veritable danger signals of the parlous and alarming condition of society.⁴⁷

With these general disturbing tendencies, there was one grave danger which loomed above all—the dreaded spectre of atheism stalked abroad in the land. The clergy early recognized this danger and dwelt upon this particular point. They do not in general confine themselves to a vague denunciation of the present evil generation, but specify that peculiarly heinous form of sin. And the considerable number who make a specialty of touching upon this obnoxious description of guilt, prove it to be more than a coincidence.⁴⁸ The earliest Jeremiah is the Rev. Nathaniel Emmons, who, on November 3d, 1790, thus notices the present fashion of iniquity: "This spirit of infidelity and scepticism which begins to spread and prevail among us threatens to destroy our remaining religion and virtue. The time was

(46) "Ye Fathers of the people, arouse, and attend to stifling the hideous monster (just creeping into a form, so pregnant with mischief), before it is too late, and frustrate the attempts now making by a few interested persons, to establish a theatre in this town.." *Herald of Freedom*, June 15, 1790; *ibid*, Jan. 8, 1790. In October a town meeting was held in Boston to consider the question of allowing a theatre. Samuel Adams, who was greatly opposed, attempting to speak, was rudely drowned out by voices clamoring "rather loudly" for the question which was carried "by a very large majority." *Centinel*, Oct. 29, 1791. Despite the law the plays continued the next year, 1792, and the Suffolk grand jury refused to indict. The governor (see a sarcastic piece on Hancock's uncomfortable position and predicament. *Ibid*, Dec. 8, 1792.) had a player arrested but the judges obedient to the popular clamor released him. Amory: Sullivan, I:273-4. In January of this year, 1792, the attempt to repeal the law forbidding theatres failed by an adverse vote of 99 to 44. *Centinel*, Jan. 28, 1792. Finally Boston was permitted to have a theatre under suitable restrictions, but the bill prohibited the drama, under heavy penalties, in all other towns. Amory: Sullivan, I:274.

(47) *Impartial Herald*, June 27, 1795: "there is greater decorum on Sunday observed here..than in many places around us..whereas it is the practice of some people to walk abroad on the Sabbath..It is submitted..whether such practises may not be changed for the better?" See another complaint on laxity in Sabbath observance in the *Farmer's Weekly Museum*, Oct. 24, 1794, from the *Conn. Courant*.

(48) The *Independent Chronicle* before the assertion could have been used as a weapon against the clergy observes: "The forms of superstition have long been sinking into discredit, but as they have retired, infidelity has come forward in their place. Superstition is not the prevailing characteristic of the present day..But..impiety, irreligion and infidelity abound.." *Aug.* 28, 1794.

when we were distinguished among all other nations [for righteousness]... But alas! how is the gold become dim! how is the most fine gold changed?... For near twenty years past various causes have... introduce[d] almost every species of vice and corruption.’⁴⁹ On April 11th, 1793, the Rev. David Tappen finds “our character in respect to religion is greatly corrupted... Sceptical, deistical and other loose and pernicious sentiments... have been boldly advanced and rapidly diffused...” and begs his audience to “show the world by our example, that the progress of true knowledge and freedom has no connection with the growth either of deism or atheism.”⁵⁰ The condition of religion is elsewhere gloomily described as affected by a “spirit of infidelity and profaneness [which] awfully prevails.”⁵¹ “At this day,” exclaims the Rev. T. C. Thatcher, “the religion of Christ is opposed in every form.”⁵² While another clergyman feelingly ejaculates: “The Christian Religion, and its social institutions are spurned at, and rejected.”⁵³ With sorrow does the Rev. Levi Frisbie inquire,⁵⁴ “is it not a melancholy truth, that in these days of boasted light and liberty, people seem to have too much forgotten that government has any connection with religion, or any dependence on the appointment or authority of God?”

(49) Even that venerable institution in Boston, the Thursday Lecture, is “so much neglected... [that] there seems to be very little attention paid to the labours of the associated Clergy...” Ind. Ch., Dec. 3, 1795

(50) p. 30.

(51) Roby, J., April 17, 1794, p. 24.

(52) Lynn, Nov. 20, 1794, p. 15.

(53) Morse, J., Charlestown, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 14.

(54) Ipswich, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 23. A letter from Jedidiah Morse to O. Wolcott betrays quite an alarmed and almost downcast feeling: “I wish ‘the habits & principle of N. England,’ may prove a security agt. ‘the mental epidemic, that is spreading through the world.’ But we have too many among us who are already deeply affected with the contagious disease both in their politics & religion—And Paine’s ‘Age of Reason’ & the vile answer to it by Wakefield are I am afraid helping to spread the disease this way—These aim a blow at the root. But I hope the people at large have wisdom, good sense, & faith in their religion sufficient, under Providence to discern & to avoid the dangers with [which] threaten to deprive them of their civil blessings, &... religious hopes.” Charlestown, Oct. 15, 1794. Wolcott MSS., Conn. Hist. Soc.

The plain unvarnished truth is put to the congregation when it is asked: "Has not Infidelity made—is it not still making an alarming progress with us?" Still another minister pointedly says: "a spirit of luxury and I fear we may add of irreligion and vice hath spread and increased. . . . We need not roam to all parts of the United States to produce evidence, for we may find sufficient within our own Commonwealth."⁵⁵ It is at this early period—for the lamentations of the clergy increase markedly for the rest of the decade—that the Rev. Jonathan Strong paints the religious condition with the blackest colors: "Never did America see a period when licentiousness, infidelity, and open opposition to. . . Christianity triumphed, as at the present day. Many come forward and boldly deny the divinity of the holy scriptures. . . . Even under the meridian light of the gospel, infidelity, [and] irreligion, . . . triumph and prevail."⁵⁶ But the clearest evidence of the alarm which was being felt is shown in the Discourse Preached at the Ordination of the Rev. Samuel Shepard at Lenox, April 30th, 1795, by the Rev. Cyprian Strong, when he bears witness as follows: "The circumstances of the present time are such as call for the faithful and most strenuous exertions of Ministers. . . . It is a truth. . . . that. . . open Infidelity and down-right Deism are prevalent to an alarming degree," and he continues descanting on "Our dangerous and alarming situation. . . there is now a peculiar reason why Ministers should be faithful, and exert themselves with uncommon zeal . . . when the great and essential doctrines of the Gospel are so much called in question and practical

(55) Thatcher, T., Dedham, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 20.

(56) Randolph, Nov. 19, 1795, pp. 25-6. See also Gardner, F., Leominster, Nov. 19, 1795, p. 15; Lathrop, J., West Springfield, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 19; Barnes, D., Hingham, April 5, 1796, p. 16; Leonard, D., A Funeral Sermon, delivered. . . at. . . Martha's Vineyard, November, 1, 1795. . . p. 14; Cumings, H., Billerica, June 28, 1795, esp. p. 6; Harris, T. M., Boston, Jan. 1, 1796, pp. 22-3.

religion is so much on the decline.'⁵⁷ This is sounding the tocsin of danger with a vengeance.

It was the open circulation of infidel writings which contributed to the vigor and spice of their denunciations of the present perverse and crooked generation.⁵⁸ That there should be this condition, or even the suspicion of it, shows a clear departure from the past in New England.⁵⁹ No wonder the clergy considered the American Revolution as "opening the floodgates of iniquity" when one of its heroes, Ethan Allen, actually published a deistical book called the *Oracles of Reason*.⁶⁰

(57) pp. 25-6. The writer has examined a number of ordination sermons from 1790 to 1800 and the unanimity from 1795 to 1800 with which the ministers dwell upon the sobering and distressing conditions of religion and the prevalence of atheism is remarkable. From 1790 to 1795 the writer has failed to find any especially lugubrious reference to atheism upon such occasions, but the difference after 1795 is striking. See Appendix H.

(58) Besides *The Age of Reason*, there are the following authors ["who have induced flimsy opinions, called..Deistical to predominate"] "Hume and Bolingbroke and Boulanger..in his 'Christianity unveiled'.." *Salem Gazette*, Aug. 9, 1796. *The Centinel* (of July 15, 1795) made the announcement: "The booksellers are fully sensible of the fatal effects to society flowing to the country of its author [Paine] from the principles which it advocates. They read with horror the black catalogue of crimes..committed by the atheists, who lately ruled France...A work still more vile and pernicious..lately sent..to..the principal booksellers of Boston, who..unanimously..returned the books to the city..whence they issued." Suspicion points the accusing finger at Philadelphia where that unscrupulous editor, B. F. Bache, who was eager "to circulate the second part of 'the Age of Reason'..because..[of] a fondness for the sentiments which that contemptible pamphlet contains." *Fed. Orrery*, June 16, 1796, from the *Gazette of the United States*. If this was not the book see William Cobbett's remarks on pages 11 and 12, foot notes, of his *Political Censor*...published in Philadelphia, 1796. Even his brazen cheek puts on an unaccustomed blush when referring to a certain American edition of Sterne's writings, for sale in William Bradford's shop in Philadelphia. In reply to Volney's *Ancient Ruins* (See *Salem Gazette*, March 7, 1797.) Dr. Priestly attached to the third edition of his *Observations on the Increase of Infidelity, Animadversions on the Writings of several Modern Unbelievers*, and especially the *Ruins of Mr. Volney*, Phila., 1797. To which Volney replied in a pamphlet, *Observations upon the Increase of Infidelity*... Phila., 1797. (See *Salem Gazette*, April 21, 1797.) Priestly's *Observations* were very popular. First edition was printed at Northumberland, Pa., 1794, second at the same place 1795, and it was reprinted at Salem, Mass., 1795. *The Character and Doctrine of Jesus Christ...to which is added Reasons for Scepticism in Revealed Religion*, by John Hollis [N. Y., 1796.] was a sufficiently disquieting book, but not so much so as *Prejudices Destroyed* (by J. M. Lequinio, a member of the National Convention) which was far more "pernicious" in its tendencies. It was sometimes added to the *Age of Reason* as at Worcester in 1794. Volney's *Common Sense or Natural Ideas opposed to Supernatural*—published in New York in 1795—was an elaborate and open attack upon Christianity. Two other translations from the French were more veiled assaults: *Sentiments upon the Religion of Reason and Nature*.. Phila., 1795., and *Rational and Revealed Religion calmly and candidly Investigated and Compared*. London, 1794.

(59) On September 3d, 1796, a correspondent in the *Centinel* inquires: "Might not a BIBLE SOCIETY in America, be very useful in counteracting the effects of *Anti-Bible Societies*, who are industriously circulating in every part of our country, the poisonous works of Tom Paine?"

(60) Eliot, J., Boston, Nov. 20, 1794, p. 13, foot note. Its complete title was *Allen's Theology or the Oracles of Reason*. See also *Western Star*, March

The sensation of this period of excitement is, however, the famous book of Thomas Paine, *The Age of Reason*, which was published in this country in 1794.⁶¹ The popularity of this book is an interesting proof of the remarkable growth of the spirit of inquiry and progress,⁶² which later finds its development in Unitarianism, in literature and in reforms of various kinds. The "glacial period" in New England was thoroughly past. Despite the efforts of the clergy the book was eagerly read and doubtless by the saint as well as the sinner, for it is considered "strange, that, in this age . . . such a work should be fashionable;" and it is hopefully concluded that "nothing but the name of Thomas Paine has given it a reputation."⁶³ "Although a late pamphlet, and others more subtly ingenious, may be spouted against the Bible,"⁶⁴ yet the clergy were not dismayed rather would they buckle on the armour of Christianity more firmly, and stoutly man the breach in the walls of Zion which these infidels were making; for "God is able to defend his own cause."⁶⁵

From the moment of its publication it attracted great attention and reprobation from not only the clergy but the laity.⁶⁶ Many were the answers written against the book, so dangerous did it appear to the orthodox both because of its contents and the

1, 1796; *Farmer's Weekly Museum*, Oct. 10, 1794. This is said to be the first deistical book published in America. Its renewed activity in circulation is evinced by the attacks upon it.

(61) See appendix I.

(62) "For people have lost their former implicit faith in the opinions of Ministers, and pay no respect to their bare assertions. They demand evidence.. and this renders it necessary for Ministers to be mighty in the Scriptures.." N. Emmons. A Sermon delivered at Salem, in New Hampshire, January 4, 1797, at the ordination of the Rev. John Smith, p. 22. Other evidence of this independent restless spirit inimical to unquestioning authority is the plaint of the Rev. David Osgood: "So general is the propensity to licentiousness, that the spirit of the times will hardly suffer a man to maintain order and discipline in his own house." Medford, Nov. 19, 1795, p. 22.

(63) Elliot, J., Boston, Nov. 20, 1794, p. 13, foot note.

(64) Clark, P., Norton, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 18.

(65) Gardner, F., Leominster, Nov. 19, 1795, p. 15.

(66) Indeed such an uproar was occasioned and so much damage to the democrats and the cause of France that the *Independent Chronicle* admits: "It is a circumstance to be regretted that the celebrated Paine..should have touched on RELIGION.." Sept. 25, 1797.

great reputation of the author. However strong the pretense was to despise it as containing "nothing new save...[its] bold and indecent manner, [and] ... It can do no harm except to the young and superficial...[and though] The Deist...will blush to see his cause so miserably handled...Indeed it's provoking to see the Christian religion...insulted by the brayings of the ass..."⁶⁷ the remarkable number of answers betrays the perturbation of pious minds. Although that book is "more fraught with errors... of religion and ancient literature than any of the same size with which I am acquainted in the English language,"⁶⁸ a new edition—the 6th American edition was printed at Worcester in 1794—was in the press on May 16th, 1795, as the Centinel announces.⁶⁹ But this was not the only agent of moral destruction which the French Revolution produced. For it was noted that "Among the many pernicious importations from abroad, we may reckon, as none of the least, infidel and atheistical books."⁷⁰

Neither did these tares sown by Satan fail to fall upon good ground nor to bring forth much pestilential fruit to vex and grieve the godly. Indeed in the newspapers it is lamented: "Thomas Paine, that infidel in religion...seduces many of you, my countrymen. You read his 'Age of reason,' and think the Bible a last year's Almanack."⁷¹ And again, "Thomas Paine, could he survey that numerous herd, transformed from credulous christians to infidels, by his 'Age of Reason'...would sigh for the

(67) Hampshire Gazette, Dec. 17, 1794. Taken from a book, *The Signs of the Times*, by Dr. Linn. This was a New York clergyman who was converted from admiration of the French because of their atheism.

(68) *Ibid.* March 25, 1795. From the sermon of the Rev. S. S. Smith.

(69) The Massachusetts Spy denounces it as a "paltry performance, which is intended to shake their faith in the religion of their fathers." Sept. 21, 1796. From the Rutland Herald. The Salem Gazette is equally severe, denouncing it as "a bungling vamp of obsolete [sic] infidelity written by a drunken author." Aug. 9, 1796.

(70) Fiske, N., Harvard College, Sept. 7, 1796, p. 17.

(71) Mass. Spy, Nov. 18, 1795, from the Farmer's Weekly Museum.

mischief he had wrought.”⁷² Even to the wilds of Maine had this demoralizing book penetrated, since a missionary is distressed to find that “All preaching is thought by many here to be needless; and the ‘Age of Reason’ is too sweet to the people. Oh! The bad effects of lay preachers of several sorts and of deistical writers...How sad is....[the] low state of religion in this place, and the corruption of principle.”

So thoroughly aroused were the clergy against the French and their Revolution that they openly began a boycott: “Let us vigilantly guard our [children’s] minds and our own against the modern infidelity...”⁷⁴ “We cannot be too careful to avoid the contagion of their present principles.”⁷⁵ “Those of my humble and imitative countrymen who adopt their opinions implicitly from this nation [France], and who so bend after every revolution of party [blindly admire]... These...[who] mad with rage against religion...[have] instituted a farce in the temple of reason.”⁷⁶ “Let us carefully guard against...a perverse Infidelity—against the old-fashioned Deism and disregard of divine revelation; and the late, abominable Paganism and shocking contempt of God’s holy word and institutions...[in France]...”⁷⁷ “Let us not abuse this liberty [of conscience], to licentiousness and infidelity.”⁷⁸

(72) Ibid, Feb. 23, 1796. The sage advice is given in the Greenfield Gazette, Nov. 17, 1796, to “read your Bible instead of the ‘Age of Reason.’” The Independent Chronicle, Dec. 28th, 1795, says: “some...applauded this book...this offended some of the clergy, who disgraced the religion they preach, by supposing it to be in danger from the desultory, and contemptible writings of Tom Paine.”

(73) Coll. Me. Hist. Soc. IV (1856) 361. The diary is dated 1797, Buckfieldmills, [Me.].

(74) Tappan, D., Cambridge, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 24. On page 27 he says: “every sentiment of religion and patriotism...calls forth our utmost vigilance in guarding our happy country from the poison of these foreign principles and manners.”

(75) Ware, H., Hingham, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 22.

(76) Smith, S. S., Philadelphia, Feb. 19, 1795, quoted in the Hampshire Gazette, March 25, April 1, 1795.

(77) Mellen, J., Hanover, Feb. 19, 1795, pp. 32-3.

(78) Wadsworth, B., Salem, Dec. 15, 1796, p. 15.

These were the sort of wise counsels and admonitions guarding the people from too warm zeal for the French Revolution,⁷⁹ which the clergy constantly gave.

There was such "great danger of imbibing the atheistic sentiments so openly avowed and publicly countenanced by a nation with which we have close connections and constant intercourse"⁸⁰ that the immigration into this country was viewed with mixed feelings even as early as 1795.⁸¹

The Revolution itself was considered as a seductive moral plague, as the clergy repeatedly pointed out with earnest warnings: "Give heed, lest your just admiration of a great and gallant people should lead you to favor their atheistical philosophy... Beware of too close a connection with the vicious and

(79) See Barnard, T., Harvard College, Sept. 3, 1795, p. 24. J. Wentworth wrote to the Rev. J. Belknap, Halifax, July 24, 1795, concerning "these distracted times, when the mighty power of France is madly employed to destroy our religion & thereby...our social order..." Belknap Papers, Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., 6th Ser., Vol. IV., pt. III., p. 601-2.

(80) Ware, H., Hingham, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 22.

(81) The change in attitude toward the French Revolution on account of the spread of liberal, to speak mildly, thought and belief cannot be illustrated better than in the conversion of the Rev. John Lathrop of West Springfield. A man of firm democratic sentiments, strongly prejudiced in favor of the Revolution, he denounces in a sermon (July 4th, 1794) a standing army and a public debt. He demands frequent elections: "To prevent a declension of government into aristocracy, the rewards for public services should be moderate;" and an organized, well disciplined militia; and further says: "The combination of influential men to recommend and support certain candidates, may be as dangerous, as corruption itself." All this is good democratic doctrine. The next year he remarks (Feb. 19, 1795) that "A rapid increase of foreigners, may be attended with some danger...[which] may...cause parties...corruptions in government, and degeneracy of morals." In addition, he begins to think "our moral state...surely is not the most promising..." The year after he comes out flat-footed with the statement (Aug. 25, 1796): "The immigration of foreigners...will be attended with real danger to the purity of religion," and is willing to attribute "The open, undisguised appearance of infidelity in the present day...[to] those political convulsions and revolutions," but believes the American Revolution ought to bear the major share of the guilt. In the next year his convictions have changed so radically that he is decidedly of the opinion that prevalence of robbers and incendiaries in the United States may be directly imputed to the French Revolution! See his "Discourse," delivered at the Public Lecture [at Boston] on Thursday, March 16th, 1797. The next year was delivered A Sermon on the Dangers of the Times from Infidelity and Immorality and especially from a lately discovered Conspiracy against Religion and Government. See esp., pp. 12-18. In 1799 on the National Fast Day, he attacked the French and their atheism saying: "It is well known that...Books, calculated to excite a contempt for the holy scriptures, are scattered over the country. Missionaries are employed...to destroy your Government...The more effectually to perform their work, they endeavor to prejudice the people against religious institutions...columns of newspapers are constantly occupied to render...the religion of the country despicable." p. 18.

debauched nations of the old world’’⁸² “since the French commotions, which were not only serving to overturn political regimes but religion itself, were extending their baleful effects to these shores through not only atheistical books, but libertine characters. . . . Those, who have disturbed the peace of believers, and endeavoured to turn the christianized and the enlightened world up side down, are come hither also.’’⁸³ “While others have been pleased with the large immigration. . . into this country. . . it has excited in my own mind fearful apprehensions; as I knew that they would bring with them the vicious habits of the old world. . . . And my foreboding fears have been realized. . . .’’⁸⁴ Even the Rev. Mr. Lathrop, who up to this time is democratically inclined, asserts: “The immigration of foreigners. . . will be attended with real dangers to the purity of religion.’’⁸⁵

The idea that atheism is prevalent and that it will become widespread in America through contagion from France is not confined to clerical minds alone.⁸⁶ The newspapers, especially during 1796, have many references to the dangerous situation. Granted that the aim was largely political and that it is a lamentable fact that “we should see Religion put forth as a stalking horse, and the people aroused on this subject as if our piety were in danger,’’⁸⁷ the very fact that the charge was politically efficient throws

(82) Sampson, E., Plympton, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 21.

(83) Fiske, N., Harvard College, Sept. 7, 1796, p. 17.

(84) Story, J., Salem, Feb. 19, 1795, pp. 24-5.

(85) West Springfield, Aug. 25, 1796, p. 9.

(86) Mass. Mercury, Aug. 5, 1796. This is No. 3 of the “True American.” Nor is this fear peculiar to New England. It is shared in other states. The Massachusetts Spy, Dec. 9, 1795, says: “A number of the inhabitants of Schenectady, are about forming. . . a Society, for preventing. . . the profanation of the Sabbath. Some spirited measures have also been adopted, at New York, for this laudable purpose.” Philadelphia is greatly exercised for “some distinguished characters had determined to give the full authority of their example in favour of a diligent attention to public worship, in consequence of dangerous excesses, and for the preservation of the public morals.” Salem Gazette, Dec. 29, 1795. Yet Rev. Pitt Clark is pained to discover that “even some of our rulers appear backward in adding their influence to [religion]. . . .” Norton, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 18.

(87) Salem Gazette, Nov. 8, 1796.

a most interesting light on the interweaving of politics and religion at this period. Politicians do not push a dead issue. However that may be, the federalist newspapers seconded the clergy in their complaints. A piously minded writer finds that "In these days, when infidelity is rapidly gaining ground,religion...has become unfashionable and is considered as unworthy of attention..."⁸⁸ Another with a groan inquires "can the soul, fired with love to its country, suppress the sigh of sorrow, to find infidelity, and impiety, rearing their snaky heads among us..."⁸⁹ Governor Adams, in his proclamation of March 31st, 1796, appointing a Fast day, notices this declension of religion with the words: "That it would please [God to] put a stop to the progress of Profaneness and Impiety...which threaten us with heavy Judgment."⁹⁰ It is further asserted "modern unbelievers...are now busily assaulting it [christianity] with every weapon of reason or ridicule."⁹¹ But a sceptic asks: "would not a foreigner...judg[ing]...by our newspapers...judge that Religion was in danger? That there exists here a combination, having for an object [to] extirpate christianity, and obliterate every vestige of piety from amongst us... Yet how contradictory is this to truth... And who are they that are thus anxious about Religion? Is it [not] that class of powerful and wealthy...who are scarcely ever seen inside of a place of worship..."⁹² While "the present age... with regard to matters of morality and religion is [believed to be] more an age of licentiousness than an 'age of reason'..." may be somewhat exaggerated, yet there is genuine alarm and real cause for apprehension, since in the press there has "been a

(88) Fed. Orrery, Feb. 11, 1796. See also Mass. Spy, May 25, 1796.

(89) Mass. Spy, March 2, 1796.

(90) Ibid, March 16, 1796.

(91) Salem Gazette, July 19, 1796.

(92) Ibid, Nov. 8, 1796.

late discussion, whether the religion of a country ought to be openly insulted. Judge Rush has expressed his doubts...'⁹³

Clearly, by the year 1796, there seems to have been so great and so general a fear that the clergy⁹⁴ as well as others made great exertions to oppose this flood of irreligion, which, coming to a large extent from France, was pouring over the land in a devastating flood.⁹⁵ The Mendon Association,⁹⁶ in the October meeting, 1796, "taking into consideration the

(93) Ibid, Aug. 30, 1796. His address to the grand jury had more than a tincture of politics for he asserts: "To the native growth of infidelity among us..arguments have been made, in consequence of our admiration of [France]..more especially as [Paine]..has..indirectly endeavored to justify their blasphemous measures to extirpate [religion].. Save us, gracious Heaven, from such patriots, and the extension of their baneful principles among us." Western Star, May 3, 1796. This was much quoted. See e. g. Hampshire Gazette, May 4, 1796.

(94) The clergy may well be excused for believing that Satan is abroad in the land when such a pamphlet is published and circulated as the following: "The writer of these Notes, professes to be a hearer of the Apostles; of consequence he cannot be a hearer of the clergy..He is willing to avow..that he ..rejoice[s] at the present deep consumption and approaching fall of the Clergy's kingdom..The Clergy have long persuade[d] people, that their character and cause, and the cause of christianity must stand or fall together..never were causes more opposite..Infidelity has been greatly promoted by a set of men whose pernicious ways..have been followed by many..Open infidelity seems now to be rapidly increasing and undermining that religion which is christian only in name..Such as..hear the heavenly proclamation..will think there is no more reverence due to the positive assertions of the word of Clergyman, than to ..Thomas Paine..[Both] are equal authorities..To [God]..the former are answerable, for their hypocrisy, and pride, and the latter for his blaspheming..and both for their labours in the business of deceiving mankind." The Contrast, or Striking Opposition Between Christianity. And the Modern Religion Falsely Called by that Name. Containing Short Notes on Certain Parts of Mr. Thatcher's Sermon, Delivered April 17, 1796. Portsmouth, N. H., 1796. Another attack very possibly by the same person, was: Observations on Mr. Buckminster's Sermon, delivered February 28th, 1796: on The Duty of Republican citizens in the Choice of their Rulers. Portsmouth, N. H., 1796. Another book was The Shaver's New Sermon for the Fast Day..6th edition.. Phila., 1796.

(95) Nor were the democrats backward in casting this unhappy situation in the teeth of the clergy. One kind "Friend to the Clergy" addresses a lengthy discourse entitled "A serious, candid, and plain Address, to the CLERGY." "I would suggest to your consideration..whether at this day..political controversy.. may not injure the CAUSE OF RELIGION...never was there a time when you.. were more immediately called on to defend the GREAT DOCTRINES of your profession." Ind. Ch., May 26, 1796. Another "Friend" makes a like address "in this Day of INFIDELITY" when he pertinently inquires: "would it not be more conducive to a general attendance on public worship if some of the Clergy were less censorious in..the pulpit? If they were less inclined to irritate their hearers by injudicious, acrimonious political discourse.." Ibid, Nov. 24, 1796. "A Friend to the Clergy" asserts: "The declension of Christianity at the present day, is undoubtedly a great cause of lamentation.." Ibid, Nov. 2, 1797. "A Layman" who replies to an earlier attack by "A Friend to the Clergy" says: "Since the revolution [here and in]..France, although tyranny..received a check..and many blessings [resulted], yet all good men..lament the detention, I had like to have said the extinction of Christianity in both countries. In France it is nearly annihilated, in America the respect formerly paid to Christianity and to the teachers of it, is almost laid aside." He further mourns that "the infidelity of the present age exceeds that of any other.." Ibid, Oct. 26, 1797. "In this age of reason," remarked a censorious critic, "the Reverend Clergy

increasing prevalence of infidelity, and of the uncommon exertions of many to prejudice the minds of people against revealed religion, [and considering] it their duty to write...to check the progress of sentiments so fatal to the souls of men and injurious to society," authorized a compilation entitled *Evidences of Revealed Religion* to be published.⁹⁷

Altogether the clergy had every reason to enter into the arena of politics. As in the Revolution, when their ministrations were needed, they offered them freely, so now in this dark crisis for government and religion were their activities displayed with no less imposing force and effective result.⁹⁸

by countenancing with their smile Idle Worship lesson the validity of the Bible more than the writings of Tom Paine.. In the Oration [at Harvard]. Washington was mentioned six or eight times..the Supreme Being not once." *Ibid*, July 25, 1796.

(96) This association was of Worcester County and was a large and powerful club. The criticisms which were passed upon these meetings and associations by the democrats show how effective they were. For an account of this association, see Blake, M., *History of the Mendon Association*. It was composed of the pastors of 33 different churches in 29 towns. The author says: "The deadening influence of the Revolution, and the blasted path of the infidelity imported with our French allies, are still traceable [in 1850]." p. 25.

(97) The book was published in Worcester in 1797 and in Northampton in 1798. What is interesting above all is that one quarter of the pages are concerned with strictures against deistical writings (pp. 196-252.) Of these 56 pages, 42 are occupied with refuting the Age of Reason. In a eulogy of it the *Massachusetts Spy*, March 29, 1797, says: "So much noise has been raised in the country—lately by Thomas Paine, and other Deistical writers... [that] This..is a valuable work. It will be worth..a thousand times its small price [37½ cents] if it..hold[s] the younger members of..families back from the licentiousness of the present time." Another book which was published in Boston in 1797 for largely the same purpose (see p. 3) was *Thoughts on the Christian Religion*.. See also U. Ogden, *Antidote to Deism*, 2 vols., 1795.

(98) The Clergy "in the vicinity of Cambridge" were moved to draw up a petition against the iniquitous tendencies of the present day, especially in regard to the amount of unnecessary travelling on Sunday. There are comments on this action in the *Salem Gazette*, Oct. 21, 1796, and caustic remarks in the *Independent Chronicle*, Nov. 24, 1796. See also *Impartial Herald*, Nov. 4, 1796, from the *Centinel*. The address was published Oct. 11th, 1796. However it would seem that such action was timely. See "Epaminondas" (July 8, 1797.) in the *Impartial Herald*, who descants on the "institutions of religion..[which are] so frequently violated" and on Sabbath breaking. See also the *Mass. Spy*, March 15, 1797: "By the help of their books [i. e. the French], their instructions, and their examples, we are making such..improvements in..infidelity; [that] should the inhabitants of this country improve as fast..as they have since the Revolution, I expect..to see our merchants..farmers..mechanics as..busy..on the Sabbath, as the teamsters and tavernkeepers in the country, and as the barbers, hair dressers, and hostlers, in the city are now." Indeed so rapid had the declension proceeded that "To sleep in church..is now so customary, that scarce anybody seems to think it..indecent or ill-timed." *Impartial Herald*, July 15, 1797, from the *Mass. Spy*. See also Hitchcock, Enos, A New Year's Sermon delivered at Providence [R. I.] January 1, 1797; Cary, Thomas, A Sermon delivered at Charlestown, July 23, 1797, p. 21; Dwight, Timothy, *The Nature and Danger of Infidel Philosophy Exhibited in Two Discourses*..September 9th, 1797.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE POLITICAL POWER OF THE CLERGY.

The question arises, were these Jeremiahs correct in describing the religious condition of America and especially New England as being in so desperate a state; so threatening indeed that "unless these devouring channels ["luxury....vice and irreligion"] be stopped, our destruction will be inevitable, and great—greater, perhaps, than the downfall of Greece and Rome, or than the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah?"¹ By no means was the pessimism justified. While it is difficult indeed to measure the amount of genuine religious feeling at this period, it can be affirmed that in New England, at least, the prevailing tone in society was religious.² Whether it was far more formal and given over to outward observance is not the question. The point is that a man immediately lost caste and was a marked man, shunned by all, were he suspected of atheism or even deism. The studied attempts of the federalists to fasten upon the republicans the odium of atheism and opposers of religion, which was materially aided by the latter's fierce attacks on the clergy, shows the very great force of such an accusation. The qualifications of John Bacon for congressman are set forth at length, but topping the list is the fact that he is "a true Christian."³ The aspirant for political honors was a prominent republican, hence the scorn

(1) Clark, P., Norton, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 23.

(2) B. Rush writes to John Adams: "Recollect . . . your definition of a New England man. It was, 'He is a meeting going animal.'" Works, IX:637, foot note.

(3) Hampshire Gazette, Oct. 28, 1800, from the Pittsfield Sun. The same paper says on Jan. 6th, 1796: "one of the most virulent of the traducers of the President, and of the Federal Government . . . has been in the country about three years, most of which time he has spent at taverns, preaching down the Christian religion, and challenging our Ministers to defend it."

of the Hampshire Gazette, when it exclaims: "A religious Jacobin! Did anybody ever hear of such a Creature?"⁴ "Before you can make a Jacobin of an American, you must strip him of religion..."⁵ seems to have been the conclusion zealously propagated by their opponents. "The late impious and blasphemous works of Thomas Paine... have been very industriously circulated in the United States, by all *that class* of people, who are friendly to Mr. Jefferson's politics..."⁶ is a charge that is so often repeated that it must have had some foundation.

Evidence of the marked difference between New England and the Middle States,⁷ for example, in regard to their religious susceptibilities is shown by the attitude of the democratic Philadelphia papers and the representatives of that school in New England. The former do not hesitate at times to attack religion in the most open fashion, while the latter never ventures to antagonize the prevailing feeling.⁸ It did attack the clergy for their political preaching, but carefully avoided, until after 1800, any derogatory remarks concerning religion itself.⁹ But this far less objectionable position only aroused at once a great storm of obloquy and served but to hasten the conviction that a democrat was an utterly depraved fellow of anti-religious propensities.¹⁰ Such

(4) *Ibid.*, Oct. 28, 1800.

(5) *Western Star*, Oct. 23, 1797.

(6) The Pretensions of Thomas Jefferson to the Presidency Examined; and the Charges against John Adams Refuted, p. 36. Written by Oliver Wolcott and William Smith of S. C. [Gibbs' *Memoirs* I:379, foot note] and answered by The Federalist, containing some strictures upon... The Pretensions... Phila., 1796.

(7) Much more between the North and the South. Jefferson to Levi Lincoln, Jan. 1, 1802: "I know it [the proposed answer to the address of the Baptists of Cheshire, Mass.] will give great offence to the New England clergy... Will you... examine it... You understand the temper of those in the North, and can weaken it, therefore to their stomachs; it is at present seasoned to the Southern taste only." *Works*, IV:427.

(8) There are several interesting quotations from Philadelphia papers in Hazen: *Am. Opinion of the French Revolution*, p. 270.

(9) See the *Boston Patriot*, Aug. 10, 1816.

(10) The *Western Star*, April 9, 1798, from a Pennsylvania paper says: "It is not in France your worst, or only enemies are to be found... they walk in your streets... and are to be found everywhere but in your churches."

for example is the assertion of the Connecticut Mirror: "It is true that we can scarce converse with a democrat—can hardly look upon a democratic newspaper, but we are offended with some political, religious or moral abomination..." This was on August 19th, 1816. Such a paragraph as the following is ridiculous enough at this day, but it shows how seriously the Sabbath was kept then,¹¹ especially in the country, even at 5 o'clock so near the close of that long "blue day." "A person who had lately a just

..” The Newburyport Herald, Dec. 21st., 1798, remarks: "the orchard of Mr. Peter How. was partly destroyed [“by Democratic villains”]. Mr. Peter How is a very honest, pious man."

(11) The writer of the above quotation in speaking of his journey is very careful to say: "A person who had..a just occasion" to travel. The use of that adjective "just" is significant. The scrupulous care with which Sunday was still observed, except in Boston, is remarkable. Even there, so far as church going is concerned, no laxity appears. The traveler Fearson notes: "A man who values his good name in Boston, hardly dares be seen out of church at the appointed hours. This would be viewed as a heinous crime by men who would consider the same individual's cheating his creditors as of small import." Travels, p. 113. The arrest of the judges of the Massachusetts Supreme Court for violation of the Sabbath, by travelling during the hours of worship, is sufficient proof of the sanctity of that day, despite whatever growth there was toward a less strict observance. The judges were indicted by the grand jury for this offence and the legislature had to come to the rescue of judicial character and safety by authorizing a "nol. pros." Amory: Sullivan, I:263-4. Governor Hancock "was fined for taking a turn in the mall on his way home from church." Ibid I:262-3. Hancock's vigorous action in stopping the theatre in Boston was due, if one may judge from all his other official acts, to a lively sense of the strong feeling throughout the state, except in Boston, in regard to such "immoral" things. See the Mass. Spy, May 8, 1794, for the parallel between the pious "New England aristocrat's" method of spending Sunday, and the "southern democrat's" total disregard of the sanctity of that day. The towns even legislated on Sunday travelling. Stearn: Ashburnham, p. 168. The town of Malden became greatly displeased with the "multitudes of teams travelling upon that day." So afflicted were they "with great grief" that on July 10th, 1775, they chose a committee in company with one from Lynn, "to wait upon ye Committee of Supplies at Watertown, or upon ye honorable provincial Congress..to desire that they would take effectual measures to prevent the same for the future." Corey: Hist. of Malden, p. 759. An early protest by a Bostonian is couched in the following vigorous language, which shows clearly what privations had to be endured on Sunday: "What freeman can recollect the hours of chagrin and debasement, which this Hutchinson [i. e. arbitrary] edict occasioned him without the keenest indignation, when meeting with a warden, whom on any other day he despised, he either was compelled to sculk into an alley, or like a purchased African, be sent home with a reproof! A law which for two months in twelve, not only interdicted social intercourse, but cut off even the right of communion with the happier brutes to unconfined sunshine." Ind. Ch., Feb. 14, 1782. See also Barry: Hist. of Mass., III:20; Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc., 1869-1870, p. 10, for the complaints of travelers impeded by zealous officials. Illuminating indeed is the letter of instruction to William Eden, one of the English Peace Commissioners in 1778, from the Rev. John Vardill. In order "To secure the Respect of the People in general especially in the Middle & Eastern Provinces, you will find it prudent to maintain a Gravity in your Department, to join as little as possible in Convivial Parties & Public Diversions. The Religious Principle has much influence among them; you will not..display even an appearance of contemning it by neglecting public worship." Stevens' Facsimiles, No. 438.

occasion to pass on Topsfield Road on the Lord's Day, after service [noted]...the careful observance of it by all... In the space of eight miles after five in the afternoon, he did not see one person abroad, or a single person of either sex gazing through the window... All these families are warm friends to good government" [*i. e.*, they are strong federalists].¹² The last sentence betrays that strong Phari-saical attempt of the federalists to arrogate unto themselves and their party all the virtuous and piously minded as well as those with other desirable qualities. For the separation of the sheep and the goats depended not merely on religious lines, but on social lines as well.¹³

The prevalence and power of this religious feeling extends to political questions. Certain of the New England state constitutions adopted in the last quarter of the eighteenth century give a good indication of this.¹⁴ It would almost seem that to gain political office the necessary qualification consisted of a strong religious character. Electors were warned to "be cautious that...those who have our voice for a place in Congress, are men, who...by assistance from above, have put off the old man, and have visibly the image of the...Savior."¹⁵ The legislative caucus by which Caleb Strong was nominated for governor gives among his recommendations, and not the least, that he "believes in the christian religion."¹⁶ In the Centinel it is said "you

(12) Salem Gazette, May 24, 1796.

(13) The contemptuous attitude of snobbishness which the federalists assumed is well epitomized in a letter of F. Ames to J. Smith, Boston, Dec. 4th, 1802. (Works, pt. 1, p. 315.) "Wit and satire should flash like the electrical fire but the Palladium [a proposed federalist paper] should be fastidiously polite and well-bred. It should whip Jacobins as a gentleman would a chimney-sweeper, at arm's length, keeping aloof from his soot." For the unhappy experiences with ostracism which an almost solitary democratic "gentleman"—living in Massachusetts at this time—experienced, see the woeful account of J. Story's blighted youth in Story: Life and Letters of J. Story, esp. I:96.

(14) Poore's Charters, I:964, for Massachusetts; II:1286-7, for New Hampshire; II:1871, for Vermont.

(15) Hampshire Chronicle, Sept. 22, 1790.

(16) Hampshire Gazette, Feb. 19, 1800, from the Mass. Mercury.

have given a fine character of Judge Cushing, for governor—a man of...Christian principles.”¹⁷ On the other hand, it was an insurmountable handicap for a man desirous of even the smallest political office to have doubts aroused concerning his religious orthodoxy. An unfortunate aspirant for a justice of peace in Haverhill had his appointment held up on the bare suspicion of it, which he stoutly denies as being totally unfounded. “I am informed,” writes S. Blodgett to Samuel Adams, lieutenant-governor and acting governor of the state, “that my appointment has been suspended [because]... charged...with being a disbeliever of the word of God, & a Redicular of it & a nonattendant on public worship, this charge, if true must be alarming indeed...”¹⁸ Writes Oliver Wolcott, Sr., to Oliver Wolcott: “I doubt not but the majority of the people in Berkshire are federal. An effort to set up a man for representative, of at least a very dubious moral and religious character, has failed.”¹⁹

(17) March 12, 1794. See two eulogies of Samuel Adams as a Christian in the *Ind. Ch.*, March 27, Dec. 29, 1794. The accusations against George Thatcher, congressman from the District of Maine, are interesting. At “one time his religion was not good; they had heard he could not believe in Original Sin, and in imputed Righteousness—now he was in favor of Baron Steuben’s pension.” *Centinel*, Jan. 12, 1790. A writer in the *Impartial Herald*, April 1st, 1797, approves of Increase Sumner—candidate for governor of Massachusetts—as “a man of good moral character who will regard the laws of God and his country...” Moses Gill, who was the lieutenant-governor for a number of years was exceedingly pious. See a puff on this point in the *Mass. Spy*, March 29th, 1797. An anecdote is very illustrative of that Puritan and his customs. “He had a negro among [his hired men]...and always rising early with them...prayed before breakfast and work, he [once] thanked God...that He had preserved them through the night and given them to see another morning. The negro, at the close of it, said: ‘No morning yet, massa.’” *Coll. Me. Hist.*, Soc. IV: 294. In 1800 it is asserted: “Mr. Strong is a Christian, and so is Mr. Gerry. Mr. Strong is a Federalist, but Mr. Gerry is one likewise.” *Ind. Ch.*, March 3. An “Old Whig of ’75 calls upon the free electors of Massachusetts to elect ‘(1) Men of piety, religion and virtue.’” *Centinel*, March 23, 1799.

(18) Adams Mss. N. Y. Public Library.

(19) *Litchfield*, Nov. 28, 1796. Gibbs: *Memoirs* I:403. The *Mass. Spy*, Nov. 30, 1796 (from the *Farmer’s Weekly Museum*) in reference to the Presidential election significantly says: “A ruler of pure morals, and ardent piety, every rational subject must prefer to a Deist and a Latitudinarian. A French philosopher, and an admirer of the ‘Age of Reason,’ ought not to obtain a solitary suffrage.” A further attack on Jefferson: “A quondam Governor . . . is now actually employed in revising his translation of a famous Atheistical French work. This...is intended as a sequel to the *Age of Reason*...” *Western Star*, Oct. 23, 1797. See also the *Pol. Repository*, Sept. 18, 1798: “Jefferson...has

As early as 1796 opposition to Jefferson arises because of his liberal beliefs—only liberal was not the adjective applied to his religious views by the narrow minded in New England.²⁰ The method of the federalists in this direction was a matter of complaint by the republicans. “Another person puts up some favorite, and to help the candidate he proposes, undertakes to invalidate the character and qualifications of the first. . . ; giving public information, that he is not a friend to the federal constitution, and the treaty with Great Britain—is a man of no religious principles, or is a deist, &c., &c.”²¹

The strength of religious feeling and the general horror of atheism can be gauged by the declaration of the president of Harvard College, in a newspaper in 1791, that Gibbon’s *History of the Fall and Decline of the Roman Empire* is not used in that institution.²² But the strongest evidence is presented by the extraordinary power still wielded by the clergy in all the affairs of the people.

Of their almost absolute power in the early years of the history of Massachusetts there is no question.

partaken of a Sunday’s feast at Fredericksburg (Virginia) . . while the President . . (was) shamefully aspersed, and . . religion trampled under foot!” See also *Ibid.*, Oct. 30, 1798; Stedman and Hutchinson: *Library of Am. Lit.* 4:249-251. Jefferson’s contempt for the “priest ridden” people of New England and his hatred for the clergy, who so unsparingly and unwarrantably vilified him, is well known. The bitter warfare between the two, after 1800, has been thoroughly treated in Adams: *Hist. of the U. S.*, I:307-333. But his writings before 1800 betray his fast growing resentment toward the orthodox view of him in New England.

(20) Scattered through the book, *The Pretensions of Thomas Jefferson to the Presidency Examined* . . are various strictures against his liberal religious views. On page 37 after making much of his friendship with Paine [p. 39 also] it quotes with horror the famous remark of Jefferson: “It does me no injury for my neighbour to say there are twenty gods, or no gods’ . . .” “It is not forgotten that the *National Gazette*, published . . under [his] auspices . . lost no convenient opportunity of making a mockery of religion . . [“See the . . 130th number” . .] and vilifying the clergy of the country.” p. 38. “Tom Jefferson has attempted to disprove the deluge—has made it a question whether the Almighty ever had a chosen people and has, by example and precept, discountenanced public worship.” p. 40. In the *Centinel* (Jan. 1, 5, 9, 1798) Jefferson is attacked by “A Plain American” for infidelity among other things. Monroe is likewise made the target by “Scipio, junior” in a series entitled “*The Felo de Se or Monroe convicted of inconsistency, infidelity, and ingratitude from his own DOCUMENTS.*” *Ibid.*, March 7, 10, 14, 17, 24, 31, April 4, 11, 19, 1798.

(21) *Hampshire Gazette*, Oct. 12, 1796.

(22) Adams: *Life in a N. E. Town*, p. 118, footnote.

And this controlling power seems to have continued in nearly its pristine vigor until the granting of the new charter under William and Mary. But from that time there was a gradual decline, especially on the coast.²³ The Revolution seems to have accelerated this slow growth but little at first. Nevertheless it had given birth to forces which, combined with others, were destined to emancipate the people from their excessive regard for ministerial authority.

The liberty of choosing and dismissing a minister at will was a privilege the people dearly cherished and vigorously maintained. The proposal to abrogate this power, just before the Revolution, was so zealously resented that it cost the place of those rash ministers who were converts to this new and heretical doctrine.²⁴ The attempt of the Rev. Mr. Thatcher, immediately after the Revolution, to assert this needed change in the relation of pastor and congregation fared no better.²⁵ In the pamphlet of this author²⁶ and in the reply by James Sullivan,²⁷

(23) It seems to have taken nearly a generation to deprive the clergy of their almost absolute political power. Quincy: Hist. of Harvard College, I:349; Bradford: Hist. of Mass., II:101.

(24) The clergyman was Zabdiel Adams. His pamphlet was published in 1774. Drake: Dict. of Am. Biography, p. 9.

(25) However, some of the clergy were still inclined to deny this right of their congregation. For the Rev. Ebenezer Chaplin's pamphlet *Congregationalism, or the Right and Power of Congregational Churches to choose, and to remove their Officers from Office*. [Boston, 1794] was a vigorous attack upon the prevailing custom. Two years later, Ezra Griswold published *A Letter in Answer to Rev. David Perry's Short View and Defense of the Ecclesiastical Rights of Man* [Hartford, 1796?]. This exemplifies the general attitude of the New England clergy toward this democracy which was playing havoc with their power and authority. "It appears," quoth this divine, "that Moses and Aaron, their successors, and all the civil and sacerdotal rulers of the Jews, were appointed independent of the people's suffrages. . . That Korah and his followers, who undertook to plant the tree of modern liberty, bottomed their rebellion upon the same principles, and accompanied their unrighteous deeds, with the same objections and arguments, as have been active in the service of democracy, at every seditious commotion, that has been fomented in church or state [since]." p. 11, footnote. An ironical piece in the *Medley* or *New Bedford Marine Journal*, July 1, 1796, presents the people's attitude: "For if our people should once get confirmed in this hair-brained notion, that they have a right to judge of preaching, and of the qualifications of preachers, there will be an end of all order, peace, regulation, Ministerial dignity, and profitable religion."

(26) *Observations upon the Present State of the Clergy of New-England*. [Boston, 1783.]

(27) *Strictures on Rev. Mr. Thatcher's Pamphlet Entitled Observations*. [Boston, 1784]. There is an extract from the Rev. Azel Bachus's sermon before

there appears excellent evidence that a change was in progress, both agreeing that the clergy have lost in authority by the Revolution. The former laments that he perceives a new and evident "indifference" to the ministry by the people,²⁸ while the latter soothingly maintains: "the attachment which the people have formerly had to their ministers, is by no means abated, although that servile awe, which, in a royal government, was felt both towards magistrates and ministers, may have been dissipated by the revolution."²⁹ The latter was a true observer of the trend of events. The democratic impulses engendered by the Revolution extended to the attitude of the people toward their parsons,³⁰ while the poverty of the people caused much friction between them and their pastors and the fluctuating paper currency developed many differences of opinion and even

the Free-Masons at Litchfield, Conn., Sept. 27th, 1794, in the *Hampshire Gazette*, March 18th, 1795: "Should you convert your society into a political Cabal.. you will be viewed and treated with the same contempt as has befallen Democratic clubs, Clerical Influence and Aristocratic Combinations."

(28) Thatcher, T., *Observations*, etc., p. 8. It is interesting to note how the Revolutionary doctrines had operated to pull down authority in church as well as state. For the learned divine observes: "The doctrine hath become fashionable..that, as the clergy are the creatures of the people, they ought to be kept in the closest dependence upon them; that they may, at any time, dismiss them.." p. 4. "It is highly dangerous to the interests of religion, to have such a power lodged in the hands of the people.." p. 9.

(29) Sullivan, J., *Strictures*, etc., p. 4. He further admits (on p. 8) that "There is not quite so much formality and affection, if there is so much hypocrisy, in either ministers or people now as there used to be.." A story which duly went the rounds of the newspapers in 1797, shows decidedly that the unbounded respect was somewhat diminished. The satire is that a clergyman asks a boy to direct him to a certain place. The lad replies by pointing out a sign board and telling him that "The Parson" will inform him. On asking the reason why a sign board should be thus called, the inquirer is told because it points out the way in which it itself never goes. The sermon preached at Boston at the ordination of the Rev. Clark Brown by Rev. H. N. Woodruff of Machias [Boston, 1795], in which he complains greatly of "the disposition of so many [ministers] to degrade their office, and to lessen their influence by accounting their persons suitable companions for every company and occasion.." (p. 16) signifies that the chilly aloofness of the colonial times was being relaxed and moderated.

(30) A certain irreligious "Piso" remarks: "It does not require much penetration to perceive the clergy are at their wit's end, to recover the influence lost in the American Revolution, and it seems the conviction, that the insubordination to the civil institutions of society (preached up at that day), produced consequent disrespect to religious institutions, is pretty generally understood; and from an analogy of reasoning, the same thing might happen again.." *Ind. Ch.*, Sept. 7, 1797.

quarrels, which sometimes ended in lawsuits.³¹ Western Massachusetts was especially afflicted with poverty, the chief factor of Shays' Rebellion, which caused division in flocks and even dismissals of a few shepherds.³² Perhaps the greatest shock to the authority of the Congregational clergy was the fact that many, comparatively speaking, adhered more or less openly to Great Britain. This was especially true of the western part of the state. Nevertheless, whatever diminution this order had suffered in the eyes of the people, it is true that their prestige was still unshaken to a considerable degree.³³

An incident in the election campaign of 1789 demonstrates how potent their influence was in deciding even political matters.³⁴ In the Hampshire Chronicle, taken from the Boston Gazette, is a simulated negro dialogue. Says Cuff, "I tell ye, da like dem well enuff, only da [Hancock and Adams] stand by de people and wont let de Aristick party make slabes of dem, . . . da [the "Aristicks," *e. g.*, the Bowdoin-federalists] intend to get all de ministers on dare side."³⁵ With a great flourish a republican ex-

(31) See Metcalf: Hist. of Mendon, p. 310; Daniel: Hist. of Oxford, pp. 56-9. James Sullivan in his Strictures on the Rev. Mr. Thatcher's Pamphlet, admits that "as their living arose, in a great measure, from an annual salary, when the country suffered under the oppression of paper money, they became peculiar sufferers." p. 7. Mr. Thatcher's Observations takes up in detail the minister's sufferings in this particular. Even Boston ministers were not exempt. See "Financial Embarrassments of New England Ministers" in Proc. Am. Antiq. Soc. N. S., VII (1890-1891) 129-135. Chiefly an account of the Rev. Jeremy Belknap's prolonged and acute difficulties with his parish over his salary.

(32) Holland: Hist. of Western Mass., I:299. Daniel: Hist. of Oxford, p. 60. Socially, the results in the community were deplorable: "Members of the same family became alienated..many personal enmities engendered," which, according to a note on the same page [60], were only beginning to pass away in 1818. Rev. Job Wright of Bernardston was dismissed. Am. Biog. Dict., p. 673.

(33) See Appendix J.

(34) S. Dexter to J. Bowdoin, Dedham, Dec. 13, 1783. Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll. 7th ser. VI; pt. 2, p. 30: "The Prime Minister [of Hancock, Dr. Cooper] now lies sick of a fever..his recovery..if it should take place..will give him an opportunity to be more of a spiritual man and less of a politician."

(35) March 11, 1789. W. Gordon to J. Belknap, J. Plain, [Roxbury], Sept. 3, 1779: "These parsons are strange fellows..If constitutions are attempted to be palmed upon the people which are unfavorable to liberty, one of these black coats makes his assault in open day, and demolishes the labours of a select convention, another works in the dark, and succeeds by sap." Belknap Papers, Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., 6th ser., IV; pt. 3, p. 151.

claims: "It is a fact, that an addressor to *Hutchinson* asserted, that the... [federalists] never should be able to carry their plans, till the clergy was enlisted into their service. This in a great measure has been effected..."³⁶ Indeed the same charge is made on October 5th where "An Old Tory openly asserted...that the aristocratic party could never gain an interest in America; till they had enlisted the CLERGY on their side. They have too far succeeded." The English traveller Duncan notes: "Clerical gentlemen have here an astonishing hold upon the minds of men; the degree of reverential awe for the sanctity of their office...approach to idolatry..."³⁷ This is indeed forcible testimony, but no stronger than the words which occur in a letter from Benjamin Lincoln to Washington. Referring to the adoption of the Constitution, he writes: "It is very fortunate for us that the clergy are pretty generally with us. They have in this State a very great influence over the people, and they will contribute much to the general peace and happiness."³⁸ Finally no surer proof of the influence of the clergy can be adduced than the incessant attacks made upon that order by the republicans from the winter of 1795 until after the War of 1812. That party, fully cognizant of the result of ministerial political activity, spared no pains in cajoling, threatening, and seeking to undermine their power.³⁹

(36) Ind. Ch., May 12, 1796.

(37) Travels, p. 113. He was in this country in 1818 and 1819. The Independent Chronicle, Sept. 15, 1794, announces that at the Commencement of the Rhode Island College on September 3rd, "there was An Oration...on the Political Influence of the Clergy." See also Centinel, April 27, 1796.

(38) Debates...in the Convention...of Massachusetts. p. 409.

(39) The following is a sample of the threats which the clergy were subjected to, but which had no effect upon the acerbity of their remarks: (His estimate of the number of these "forsworn" clergy was an evidence of his wish rather than the facts.) "But the most formidable part of the conduct of these people [the federalists] consists in their enlisting a few clergymen into their service. In this...they will fail as the [clergy]...will [not] join them in advocating the cause of the British, or attempt to weaken these republican principles, which have been the barrier against the introduction of the Episcopal Hierarchy into this country." Ind. Ch., Jan. 5, 1795.

This bitter warfare was precipitated by the vigorous and caustic sermon of the Rev. David Osgood on November the 20th, 1794, this being the day of the celebration by the state of the annual Thanksgiving. Up to this time whatever ill feeling existed had been largely repressed. There can be no doubt but that some of the clergy had no hesitation in expressing, privately at least, their opposition to the tenets and practices of the French, for there are occasional disparaging references to "pulpit drummers" as early as 1793 and it seems the *National Gazette*, a democratic paper, a year earlier indeed, was accustomed to "vilify the clergy" and to "constantly" ridicule religion.⁴⁰ But the sermon of Mr. Osgood precipitated a struggle which rapidly enlisted all the clergy, with few exceptions, on the federalist side and produced a union of interests and feelings which was largely responsible for that party's life in Massachusetts a number of years after it had been snuffed out elsewhere.

The ostensible cause of this anti-democratic diatribe was the rather injudicious omission of all reference to the Federal government by Gov. Adams in his proclamation for the annual Thanksgiving. At this day this slight may seem trifling, but then it loomed large in the eyes of the ardent party men. Gov. Adams and his predecessor, John Hancock, were accused of anti-national views and indeed a somewhat petty and jealous attitude toward the central government.⁴¹ At any rate this Thanksgiving day sermon made a profound sensation and aroused the sharpest division of opinion. And well it might.

(40) *Centinel*, Sept. 12, 1792. There is also in the *Hampshire Gazette*, Oct. 15, 1794, a defense and eulogy of the clergy who "have proved themselves equally useful as good citizens and public instructors." This is more than a month before Rev. David Osgood's famous sermon, which was the first notable attack by the clergy upon the democrats.

(41) This was a common belief at that time. See e. g. J. Morse to O. Wolcott, Charlestown, Dec. 19, 1794. Wolcott MSS., Conn. Hist. Soc.

For he paid his respects to the governor of the state in the following censorious words: "Unless we suppose him to have fallen under the baneful influence of those [democratic] societies [a charge often made and with a considerable degree of truth it would seem] we know not how to account for his having hazarded a proclamation in which we are directed, neither to give thanks for any advantages enjoyed by means of that government, nor even to ask the blessing of Heaven upon it." But the major part of the criticisms were directed toward the Democratic Societies and their evil tendencies and effects. Finally their alleged connection with the Whiskey Rebellion was graphically traced. Other clergymen of this persuasion found it likewise a suitable occasion for advancing their views in support of the Federal government.⁴² And while they generally were moderate in their utterances and guarded in their criticisms, the unanimity of sentiment was so striking that it led the Rev. Jedediah Morse to exult, "The thanksgiving sermons in Boston and its vicinity (with only two or three exceptions) all breathe the same spirit—[of federalism]."⁴³

But the zealous Dr. Osgood did not stand alone in the advance guard of federalism, for the Rev. Mr. Gardiner of Boston was responsible for not a little of the growing wrath of the incensed French sympathizers. If his detractors may be believed, he was accustomed to spend the Sabbath, and the other days in the week as well, echoing and even surpassing the "abusive illiberal sentiments" of the minister of Medford.⁴⁴ To relieve their harrassed feelings, the

(42) So great was the demand for political preaching that Rev. David Osgood actually felt called upon to vindicate himself for slighting the topic in his Thanksgiving day sermon at Charlestown in the afternoon of February 19th, 1795. See page 6, footnote, for the apology.

(43) To O. Wolcott, Charlestown, Dec. 17, 1794. Quoted in Love: *Faith and Thanksgiving Days of N. E.* p. 366.

(44) This is important testimony to the fact that the printed sermons of the clergy constitute only a very small fraction of the effective active anti-

democrats raised a prodigious clamor in the columns of the Independent Chronicle against these presumptuous parsons. "A Friend to the Clergy and an Enemy to Ecclesiastical Presumption"⁴⁵ appeared in several numbers, tearing the sermon and the reputation of Rev. Mr. Osgood into shreds. Still more severe are the animalversions directed toward the Rev. Mr. Gardiner of Boston. He was described as "The EPISCOPAL CANON, or the Trinity-Church Trumpeter," and again as "A certain Episcopalian 'thumper of the pulpit drum' [who]...on Thursday last endeavored to entertain his audience with what he termed *politics*...[who] denounce[d] all Constitutional Societies...[and] as for France, even the accounts of her most *signal victories* must to christians, be a *scene of Horror*."⁴⁶ The issue of December 25th is enlivened by the caustic remarks of "A Friend to Decency and Free Inquiry," and a "SEVENTY-FIVE MAN" who appears excessively spiteful in his castigations. Later the offending clergyman of Medford is severely handled by two indignant citizens. One points out "that the language of Mr. O. with respect to the French nation, is exactly similar to that used by the Bishop of *Llandaff* against the people of this country...Feb. 20, 1767... He re-

French and anti-democratic campaign which the clergy engaged in more and more. The Salem Gazette says: "We have heard much of late, both from the pulpit and press, of the baneful influence of parties, and self-created societies." Jan. 20, 1795. "Phocion" asserts: "Sentiments have been of late transcribed into sermons [against the Democratic Societies]." Ind. Ch., Jan. 26, 1795. The only printed sermon is Rev. David Osgood's attack on Nov. 19th, 1794. The Independent Chronicle on Dec. 11, 1794, comes out with a bitterness and a use of a term of reproach "British hierarchy," which was a mere commonplace later, but surprising indeed at this date: "With what effrontery then must any member of the British hierarchy be distinguished in America for reprobating the same policy in France." I. e., for omitting all reference in their constitution to "the existence of a Deity" since "the philosophers of France have copied the philosophers of America" in regard to religion and the Constitution. In a footnote to Rev. Jedidiah Morse's Thanksgiving sermon of Feb. 19th, 1795, we are favored with an extract of his (unpublished) Thanksgiving sermon of Nov. 19th, 1794: "Their cause is unquestionably good—But for their cruelties, and especially for their impieties, we can find no adequate excuse. It would discredit the best of causes..to blend such cruelties and impieties with it.." p. 52. (45) Dec. 22, 1794: The third installment came out Jan. 8th, 1795. Another Jan. 5th.

(46) Ind. Ch., Nov. 27, 1794. See also *ibid*, Nov. 24, 1794.

proaches them [that] instead of civilizing or converting barbarous infidels, they have themselves become Infidels & *Barbarians*." The other among sundry rebukes announces the alarming discovery that "some gentlemen in the clerical line...were joining the British party."⁴⁷ "A True Federalist" indignantly complains that, "It has become quite fashionable for the Clergy (especially some of a particular description) to blend a great measure of politics with the religious exercise," and then goes on to abuse Rev. Mr. Osgood liberally.

One can estimate the alarm of the democrats over the attitude of the clergy by the continuous stream of vituperation and complaint which from now on finds place in the democratic newspapers. Such attacks naturally begot replies. Mutual crimination and recrimination increase until a democrat becomes synonymous with an opponent of religion. Besides these squibs which were filling the *Independent Chronicle*, an answer to Osgood was written by James Sullivan under the guise of Citoyen Novian.⁴⁸ This was a sturdy defence of the French against the various accusations urged against them. But it achieved far less success than the first famous sermon of Osgood. That went through three editions, at least, in Boston, was reprinted in Pittsfield and is

(47) "Stentor" on the demerits of Osgood and Gardner. *Ind. Ch.*, Jan. 12, 1795. See also *ibid.* Feb. 23, 1795. Replies from the federalists were of course made. See *Centinel*, Dec. 27, 1794. The following is a good example: "de Novian's" sermon is more a libel on the French National Convention than on Mr. Osgood. For their late decrees and addresses are filled with the most lively execrations of the very barbarities and misconduct which [the latter]..condemns. This is a solemn truth. And the satellites of Jacobinism cannot contradict it. The most damning proofs are at hand..the 'address of the Convention'—the report of Gregoire of Aug. 31 'on the destruction wrought by vandalism'..the decrees respecting Lyons and Nantz—the denunciation of Clarere and Lebon, all, all, prove it." *Centinel*, Jan. 17, 1795. The natural results of the attacks on Osgood's sermon or as it was put "the scurrility which is poured against it, and its author, has the happy tendency of having it more generally read." *Ibid.*, Jan. 10, 1795.

(48) *Ind. Ch.*, Jan. 15, 1795. Amory: Sullivan, I:297. On Jan. 6th, 1795, the *Western Star* proposes republishing Osgood's sermon. Not to be outdone and to combat this the democrats proposed to reprint Sullivan's reply. "Subscriptions are received by Hon. John Bacon, Esq..in Stockbridge—in Williams-town by Hon. T. J. Skinner" among others. *Western Star*, March 24, 1795.

supposed to have been circulated in three editions in Philadelphia.⁴⁹

Although the angry echoes of the last Thanksgiving day were still reverberating throughout the land, a fresh cause of offense was offered by the use made by some ministers of the National Thanksgiving day of February 19th, 1795. This was the second of the Federal celebrations, the first being on November 26th, 1789. As a matter of fact the democrats were not prepossessed in favor of either day, since both compelled them to rejoice, as it were, over their own discomfiture.⁵⁰ In addition, the current of clerical sympathy was beginning to run rather strongly against them. On the other hand, the federalists eagerly anticipated the day, for it was surmised that Dr. Osgood would embrace the opportunity to flay his opponents again. The suspicions and fears of the democrats were more than realized, for the Rev. Mr. Osgood's remarks on that national holiday were the reverse of soothing and conciliating.⁵¹ Far from moderating his sentiments and profiting by the suggestion so liberally, not to say pointedly, illuminat-

(49) Centinel, Jan. 21, 1795. This sermon was printed entirely in the Worcester County Intelligencer, Jan. 20, 27, and in the Farmer's Weekly Museum, Feb. 10, 17, 1795; an excerpt is in the Centinel, Dec. 27, 1794. "We are told," writes a democrat in the Salem Gazette for January 20th, 1795, "that Mr. Osgood's Sermon has passed three editions. 'The Day of Doom' went through thirty, and is now forgotten." "Mr. Osgood's Sermon...has...cruized along to Halifax..." Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., 6th ser., IV: pt. 3, 585-6. And Rev. Jedidiah Morse writes to O. Wolcott, Charlestown, Dec. 19th, 1794: (Wolcott MSS. Conn. Hist. Soc.) "Mr. Osgood's sermon has grievously offended the Jacobins, poor fellows! They seem to be attacked on all sides. They must I think feel it to be a truth—that there is no peace to the wicked—they still make a noise—but it is like the groans of Despair." "The subject of Democratic Societies is now transferred from the Gazettes to the productions of the Pulpit. The great fame of one writer has encouraged many adventurers." Salem Gazette, March 31, 1795. See also *ibid.*, Jan. 20, 1795.

As a matter of fact a pamphlet gave a much wider circulation to an argument or an address than did the newspapers. Ames to O. Wolcott, Dedham, July 9, 1795: "It is also important that...vindications of the treaty should appear in the Gazettes. Better, if in a pamphlet." Gibbs: *Memoirs*, 1:210.

(50) Opposition was raised "to the recommendation of our beloved President for a...General Thanksgiving" in the Massachusetts Legislature. Centinel, July 7, 1790.

(51) See "A lover of Peace," who highly approves of Dr. Osgood's sermon. Western Star, March 3, 1795. See also in *ibid.*, June 9, 1795, the attack of "A Democrat" upon "The Clergyman" who had ventured to criticise the Democratic Societies.

ing the columns of the Independent Chronicle,⁵² the "Bishop of Medford" anathematized his adversaries in pungent, biting words.⁵³ So eminent an occasion was improved by a large number to advance their political beliefs, which had grown even more vigorous and unanimous.⁵⁴ The importance of this day is shown by the fact that there were no less than twenty-five sermons printed either by the request of the congregation or of the town.

But one solitary discordant note⁵⁵ marred the harmony of the Federal chorus, and that was piped to the tune of Ça Ira instead of Yankee Doodle.⁵⁶ A

(52) From the Ind. Ch., Jan. 15, 1795: "Our worthy President..remommended.. that we may be preserved from arrogance in prosperity...There is a degree of arrogance also assumed by some of the clerical order, as well as others; and it is hoped, the clownish Bishop of Medford will clothe himself with the garb of humility before he" preaches on the National Thanksgiving day.

(53) "I know not a greater blemish upon the capital of this commonwealth than its containing a set of shameless scribblers [the writers of the Chronicle] who a few years since, stirred up a rebellion against the government of this state, and have now contributed their full proportion in producing another against that of the United States." p. 22, footnote. "It is said..that the expense of the nation [in suppressing the Whiskey Rebellion] amounts to a million and a half of money..this sum may be fairly and honestly charged to the account of our democratic societies, their patrons, abettors and friends." p. 23. He paid his respects to the disgruntled democrats: "Some persons..who thought themselves secure of being at the head of their respective governments, were mortified at the idea of seeing their consequence lessened..it was plain that some of our governors wished to be thought sovereigns still." p. 9. He rebukes "the disorganizing tendency of state jealousy" as having a "threatening aspect" and loudly praises Washington. p. 19. Then he begins on the "ferocious and atheistical anarchy in France" and draws a most melancholy picture of the ruin of Geneva by these Jacobins. He quotes: "'Geneva is lost without resource, in respect to religion, to morals..to liberty and above all to internal peace,— for the present generation it can only be a residence of hatred and vengeance.' The same spirit, and some of the identical agents, found their way into these states and began here their fraternizing system." p. 18.

(54) Salem Gazette, March 10, 1795: "Where these pulpit politics will end, or how long the precepts of Christianity will hang suspended on the wranglings of party it is impossible to say. When our Divines shall return from the Gazettes to the Bible, society will feel the benefit, and they will better deserve even the small stipends which are now so effectively diminished by the Funding System and the Banks."

(55) The democrats would have it that the Rev. Drs. Lathrop, Stillman and Bradford were still possessed of 'patriotic sentiments,' in other words that "they returned 'thanks for the successes of our Allies' yesterday," i. e., on March 29th. Ind. Ch., March 30, 1795. But such were few and far between. The last of this trio is soon silenced, the second subsides, and the first is converted ere long to federalism. Rev. Mr. Clark of Lexington was another democratic clergyman, who was denounced as "tautological." Farmer's Weekly Museum, Oct. 13, Dec. 8, 1795, April 19, 1796.

(56) Mrs. Plucker to Mrs. Knox, Boston, Jan. 26, 1795. Knox MSS. XXXV:34: "On Monday I went to the Play, but alas no Prince [Edward of England was then visiting Boston]—he was prevented by the assurance that a large Party was formed in the Galleries to Govern the Music—and Preside for the night—and very properly put himself out of the way of Personal insult—to which the Mob was doubtless ripe for—for whenever the Box door opened, and he was

stirring sermon was this of the Rev. Ebenezer Bradford in praise of the French, of Samuel Adams and of the Democratic Societies. No halting apologies struck a minor note in his paeans of exultation over democratic triumphs. He fairly gloried in extolling everything which his brethren denounced.⁵⁷ "How thankful ought we to be, that the great disposer of all events has indulged us with such a Governor. . . . Our venerable and pious Governor calls upon us to beseech God to 'be graciously pleased to establish the *French Republic*. . . . This is coming out to the public view like a man and like a true Democrat. No velvet-mou̇thed expressions are here found; . . .

supposed to enter, There was an alarming opposition between the ragamuffins, Loyalists, & Orchestre and. Peace could only be obtained by the mortifying submission of the good to the bad—all Gentlemen were silent—The Jarvis Clan gave the words of command Ca—Ira &c.." Others suffered from this contentious party spirit. "An inhabitant of Boston wishes..that the jarring sounds of 'Ca Ira' and 'God save the King' will not be suffered to disturb the pleasure..of.. Theatre [goers].." Centinel, Jan. 22, 1794. Also *ibid*, Feb. 1, 1794. "These upstart young Aristocrats. who attempt to show their dislike for the glorious Revolution..by hissing when..Ca Ira, is called for, or played at the Theatre, are seriously advised to desist.." *Ind. Ch.*, April 25, 1794; see also Wansey, H., *Excursion to the United States*, pp. 42-3. The performance of the play, "Poor Soldiers" was interdicted in Boston because of the objections of the French Consul. Centinel, April 24, 1799.

(57) His Thanksgiving sermon of February 19th, was, if possible, more offensive to the federalists. He examines the President's Proclamation and manages to pick flaws in every cause for Thanksgiving. "In the preamble of the Proclamation, 'our exemption from foreign war,' is mentioned..Would to God, that it was strictly true..For though we have suffered much more..the year past [from "Innumerable banditti of sea-robbers"] than we ever suffered in a single year [in the Revolution]..we ought to be thankful that our case is no more deplorable than it is." p. 7. "The next thing proposed—as an object of our gratitude, is the 'Increasing prospect of the continuance of that exemption from a foreign war'..Whether the author..had his eye on the recent successes of the French Republic, or on some flattering declarations made to Mr. Jay, is uncertain.—One thing..[is] a fact..that..under God, our peace and tranquillity wholly depends on the successes of the French Republic. Had not this been great, we should before now have felt in America, in a manner we have heretofore not done, the vengeance of British tyranny." p. 8. "Whether this insurrection owed its rise to existing impolitic laws, or to.. [a] rebellious spirit [is not]..fully ascertained..no man..can pass unnoticed..the starving situation of those, whose fixed stipends have dwindled into sorry pittance by means of the Funding System. It is, moreover, devoutly to be wished that this country might be rendered more and more 'a safe and propitious asylum for the unfortunate of other countries.' This will no doubt be accomplished, when we are freed from the baneful influence of British politics, spoliation and injustice." pp. 14-15. He gratuitously added as things to be thankful for, notably "a spirit of..friendship to the rights of mankind, which has prevailed throughout the United States..So that it is exceedingly evident, that the spirit of true Americans is not fled..in these days of corruption..And here..I [can not pass over]..in silence, that noble exertion in favor of Liberty, which has been made by the several democratic associations..they..cannot fail, unless the Constitutions themselves fail—Therefore, all the true Sons of Liberty, will..say unto all the Democratic Societies, both in France and America, *Health & Fraternity!*" pp. 17-18.

*Health and fraternity . . . to [Adams] . . . Long live and prosper, thou Son of liberty while the enemies of the rights of man are clothed with shame, disgrace and confusion. . .*⁷⁵⁸

Thereupon a very pretty duel ensued between the Rev. Dr. Tappen and this militant democratically-inclined clergyman. The latter's Thanksgiving day sermon was rushed into print and hurriedly circulated by "enthusiastic Jacobins."⁷⁵⁹ This gave an opportunity to Dr. Tappen to print an appendix to his Thanksgiving day sermon, in which he roundly attacked the Rowley divine. The latter was not silenced, but merely waiting for the annual Fast day, which came on April 2d; he then delivered an answering broadside to his federalist opponent. To excite alarm amongst these clergymen "who have shown a disposition to depreciate the cause of France in this country," they are implored to "be cautious on the approaching *Fast-Day* as to what *they say* about the French Republic," for "the people would be highly irritated, if the United States should be invoked in a war with France, through the imprudence and arrogance of a few 'dignified clergymen.'"⁷⁶⁰

While the republicans were thus venting their anger,⁶¹ the federalists were not backward in pouring their vials of wrath upon Mr. Bradford, that open and almost sole representative of

(58) Rowley, April 2, 1795. p. 16.

(59) Ind. Ch., March 5, 9, May 14, 1795.

(60) Ibid, March 30, 1795.

(61) Dr. Osgood, as the leading exponent of this hated federalistic attitude, was honored with the greater share of the attention, e. g., see Ibid, March 2, 1795. "Urbanus" has a series of articles dealing in no friendly fashion with Dr. Osgood. Ibid, March 19, 23, 26, April 3, 1795. In Ibid, for April 20, an answer is made to the strictures of "Urbanus." In the Western Star, April 14, 1795, "A citizen" replies to "Jack Nips" who has attacked Dr. Osgood and manifested somewhat of a wholesale anti-religious attitude. The democrats are beginning to stay away from church because of the tempestuous emotions which the preaching excited in them. The Massachusetts Mercury observes (May 12, 1795): "The Rev. Mr. Osgood officiated at the Rev. Dr. Thatcher's Meeting House. In the forenoon he delivered an excellent and pertinent Discourse. 'My heart shall not reproach me so long as I live.' Some to whom the sentiments of this impartial Divine are particularly obnoxious absented themselves. Among these. V[inal]" (a democratic politician).

democratic sentiments.⁶² This "Vandal of Rowley" was most unkindly treated, even to being "ostracized" by the clergy; no pulpit was open to him in Essex county, (his home region); his uncle, in open meeting of the association, demanded that "he express . . . his disapprobation of all democratic societies;" and his *Christian* brethren in the ministry demanded "a *public recantation*,"⁶³ and finally practically expelled him from their association.⁶⁴ The federalists were overjoyed to gain such a formidable power as the clergy. Said one enthusiastic individual: "THE sermons delivered on the late Thanksgiving day would, if collected, form a political Bible—in which might be found . . . the most invincible arguments in favor of good order, peace and federalism, notwithstanding the pitiful aprocrapy [sic] of the '*Vandal of Rowley*.'"⁶⁵ The disgust of the republicans was manifested in their quite hopeless attempt to fasten the stigma of British sentiments upon the federalist clergy, while endeavoring to gather back these straying bell wethers into the "Rights of Man" fold. Great are the democratic laments and manifold are the complaints and criticisms.

A correspondent finds that "It is remarkable that so many of the clergy appear in favor of the Brit-

(62) "This Vandal of Rowley is an insurgent in religion (as is evident from the mischief he has endeavored to spread in various parishes,) as well as politics. Where there has been the appearance of uneasiness, he has blown up the flames of sedition. . ." He is accused of being the brother of David Bradford, a noted insurgent in the Whiskey Rebellion. And "Topsfield" says: "It is well known that he is held in general contempt by the regular clergy." *Centinel*, March 28, 1795. There is a "Dialogue between B[radford] and the Devil" in the *Mass. Mercury*, April 10, 1795, from the *Newburyport Herald*. A lively dispute occurs in the *Impartial Herald* over Bradford. April 10, 14, 21, 25; May 2, 5, 12, 1795. See also *Farmer's Weekly Museum*, Dec. 8, 1795.

(63) *Fed. Orrery*. Aug. 6, 1795.

(64) *Ibid.* See also Rev. L. Frisbie to Rev. D. Mac Clure: "Our Jacobinical Brother Bradford has indeed preached and written himself almost entirely out of credit. He was not indeed expelled from the association, but he was so roughly dealt with that he has not attended its meetings this long time." Quoted in *Love: Fast and Thanksgiving Days of N. E.*, p. 373.

(65) *Centinel*, March 14, 1795. Some optimistic federalist estimated earlier "that there are not more than one [democratic clergyman] to a state." *Mass. Mercury*, Nov. 20, 1795, from the *Conn. Courant*.

ish.”⁶⁶ “David” agrees with the statement, saying with what crumbs of satisfaction he can find in the distressing situation: “THO’ it is too true . . . that many of the clergy are strangely altered in their political principles . . . yet it is true that some . . . retain . . . those pure sentiments of Republicanism.”⁶⁷ Such that did, however, seem to have found the position neither comfortable nor lucrative.⁶⁸ Democratic disgust became more openly manifested as the summer waned. “The Old Tories” were accused “of making instruments of *some of our clergy*, who make politics, more than divinity, their study,”⁶⁹ . . . and “it is too evident there are a *few* . . . [who] have meanly surrendered every political principle which heretofore rendered them beloved and respected.”⁷⁰ Indeed, “a small part” had fallen so far from democratic grace as to “have defiled their garments.”⁷¹ Nor did the labored endeavors of the republican exhorters cease with such warnings. They demanded a complete and speedy repentance on the part of the clergy—a promise no more to feed themselves on the husks of federalism nor to pasture their flocks in such taresown fields. Solemn admonitions were addressed to the deluded clergy, such as “if the clergy of United America . . . [did not] renew their former spirit of love and friendship to the *rights of men*, and no more throw their weight into the scale of

(66) *Ind. Ch.*, July 20, 1795.

(67) *Ibid.*, July 23, 1795.

(68) In a defence of the “Introduction of politics” into sermons “which has become so common, latterly” it is said in the *Massachusetts Mercury* (for Feb. 12, 1796) that these pamphlets “are sought after with such avidity, and read with such satisfaction. . . [indeed] they are read. . . with an uncommon zest.” How strongly the tide of federalism was beginning to rise under the stimulating activities of the federalist clergy, can be readily perceived by the fact that it was complained: “the number of copies [of Mr. Thatcher of Dedham’s sermon—he being at that time a democratic clergyman] circulated in the country I find to [be]. . . very inconsiderable.” *Ibid.*, May 25, 1795.

(69) And “who run about from shop to shop to terrify women.” *Ind. Ch.*, Aug. 6, 1795.

(70) *Ibid.*, Aug. 13, 1795.

(71) *Ibid.*, Oct. 5, 1795.

aristocracy . . . '72 retribution was at hand. For "After France has made peace with all . . . except England, the American Tories, both clergy and laity, will begin to cry *pecavi* [sic] . . . '73 A rather formidable threat was elaborately set forth, and repeated in the issue of November 26th, in connection with the question of Jay's Treaty: "Should the English Ministry accomplish their designs . . . the long-attempted system of ecclesiastical hierarchy will be as assiduously pursued by the *Lords Spiritual* as civil despotism is by the *Lords Temporal*. . . When Britain becomes *powerful* within the United States and Bishops are possessed of territory, the clergy will then begin to think that the opposers of the treaty are their best friends—though *now* they are abused from the pulpit with the most illiberal *rancor*. '74

The accusations called forth stout denials from the friends of the accused. "Our clergy," said one defender, "are really independent . . . they are known in the different towns where they reside to be men of discernment and Republicans—great were their exertions in the American Revolution, and no one can believe that they are '*Old Tories and Aristocrats*' now." '75 A curious defense is offered by the "Lay Preacher." '76 "As the *Whig* divines in '1775' were instrumental in destroying the old government, perhaps a federal parson may offer some reason

(72) Ibid. Sept. 2, 1795.

(73) Ibid. Oct. 5, 1795.

(74) Much the same is repeated in *ibid.* May 12, 1796.

(75) *Mass. Mercury*, Nov. 17, Dec. 18, 1795.

(76) This "Lay Preacher" was Joseph Dennie, a brilliant though eccentric federalist writer. See a typical attack of his on the irreligion of the French in the *Farmer's Weekly Museum*, Oct. 25, 1796. His contributions gave the *Farmer's Weekly Museum* published in Walpole, N. H., a great reputation and a large circulation for the period. Its influence was unbounded with the yeomanry, nor was its sphere bounded by New England. The *Salem Gazette*, Aug. 4, 1797, says it "circulates through . . . the union, except Georgia, Kentucky and Tennessee." The belief that it was so potent in advancing federalistic doctrine is shown by the many peevish remarks in the *Independent Chronicle*. On December 18th, 1797, it is denounced as "among the most infamous of" the federalist newspapers. Another attack is made, e. g., on Nov. 20th, 1797, in *ibid.*

against subverting the new''⁷⁷ The bitter accusations continue the next year, 1796.⁷⁸ The republicans were especially incensed by the activities of certain of the Boston ministers in connection with certain prominent federalists in signing and sending out a circular letter.⁷⁹ This was designed to arouse the people, that pressure might be brought on the House of Representatives, lest they fail to carry out Jay's Treaty by refusing to pass an appropriation bill.⁸⁰ "Your Well Wisher" was particularly virulent in attacking "the *Honorable* and Reverend Committee *particularly* . . . the clerical part of this new constituted body."⁸¹ A letter from the country, which said, "But what has deceived the yeomanry is the circular letter sent out, signed by clergymen . . . [and others]" increased their wrath. "The clergy," it was thundered, "have taken a conspicuous part in promoting the adoption of the treaty; let them abide the event."⁸² The memory of this grievance kept

(77) Brookfield Advertiser, Dec. 16, 1795, from "Farmer's Weekly Museum. See also Salem Gazette, May 24, Aug. 2, 1796; Centinel, July 23, 1796.

(78) See e. g., Ind. Ch., July 14, 28, Aug. 11, Nov. 17, Dec. 29, 1796.

(79) Fed. Orrery, May 2, 1796. See the attacks on them in the Independent Chronicle, May 2nd, 1796. Beside a caustic reference to "The Royal Proclamation, which was appointed to be read in Churches, &c. [and which—it was alleged with but slight foundation—] met with . . . a cool reception in many towns" there is a long "Modest Address to the Honorable and Reverend Committee to forward Circular Letters" by "Your Well Wisher" who reproved them that "instead of declaring that were [where] 'Washington leads you cannot hesitate to follow' would it not have been more pertinent to have weighed the arguments . . . by Messrs. Madison . . . and others, before you have so fully enlisted as HERALDS to rouse the people. . . . [this meddling] has a tendency to injure [the clergy's] . . . influence in the ARDUOUS TASK OF THE MINISTRY."

(80) "It is a scandal to religion to find its sacred rites profaned, to minister to the advancement of political party-views. In the Eastern States . . . we find that the Churches and the Pulpits have been defiled to promote the supporters of a party—we find in regene[ra]ted America, Ministers of the Gospel, exerting their influence on their parishment in the Temple of God, to obtain their signatures to a petition on a political question. . . ." Ibid, May 26, 1796. For the clergy "to arrogate a controul over the Legislative body, is a specimen of Ecclesiastical interference that ought to be reprobated by every free citizen." Ibid, May 12, 1796.

(81) Ibid, May 5, 1796.

(82) Ibid, May 12, 1796. This was a fulmination by "SYDNEY." In the same issue there are attacks by "An Enemy to Priest Craft" and "Corporel Trim." In ibid, May 26th, the democrats alleged that "the principle part [of the people] who signed the petition did it through fear; More particularly when aided with that unwarrantable and clerical influence. . . ." To offset the ecclesiastical influence which was so decidedly against them, the republicans published a long letter from an "eminent Hampshire county clergyman" on the election of S. Adams and in favor of democratic policies in general. Ibid, May 26, 1796. It is not

green even to the next year, for the people are reminded that "the truly infamous British Treaty was to be gently crowded down our throats by a Royal Priestcraft. Memorial, . . . the greatest imposition ever handed to the freemen of Massachusetts since the year '75. . .'"⁸³ There was, by this time, as evidenced by the unequivocal testimony of both foe and friend, no doubt but that the clergy were heart and soul engaged in furthering the policies and principles of the Federalist party.⁸⁴ Their decisive aid in any political end was fully recognized by both parties alike.⁸⁴ The dangers which threatened both their country and their religion were the decisive factors which led them to throw their weight into the scale of Federalism.⁸⁵ The consequences of this were in the end unfortunate, for it isolated Massa-

impossible that the supposed reverend gentleman resided close to the office of the Independent Chronicle.

On the other hand, however, the county of Hampshire was greatly stirred up. In *Ibid.*, May 16th, 1796, is an extract, taken from a Connecticut paper, describing the ferment. A regiment out for Muster day took an oath to march to Philadelphia and force the House of Representatives to carry out Jay's Treaty, while the anger on account of the conduct of William Lyman, Congressman, in opposing it, was so great that a coat of tar and feathers was proposed by his loving constituents, [he was defeated that fall for Congress].

The denunciations, which continue to follow this committee, demonstrates its efficacy and the powerful influence of the clergy. In the Independent Chronicle, June 15th, 1796, there is a malediction upon that "self-created, ecclesiastical, aristocratic, mongrel society" by "A Democrat." Still later in the month, *ibid.*, June 30th, there is more about that "evangelical Self-created Committee to the different churches to alarm the citizens. . ." And still further reference in *Ibid.*, Sept. 1st, 1796.

In *Ibid.* (Dec. 26, 1796) there is a hopeless attempt to shelter the French irreligion by calling attention to the British treatment of religion "in turning the Old-South into a Riding-School, and appropriating the venerable Old-North to fire-wood. The clergy ought to think on these things." And a book entitled *Reflections on French Atheism and on English Christianity* [3rd ed., Phila., 1796] by William Richards was circulated for the same purpose.

(83) *Ind. Ch.*, Jan. 5, 1797. Nor is this the last that is heard concerning this matter, for on Feb. 5th, 1798, that committee comes in for a reviling at the hands of a still unforgiving democrat. See *Ind. Ch.* of that date.

(84) The importance of the clergy's aid is recognized by the long extracts of or entire sermons printed in the newspapers, beginning with Dr. Osgood's first partisan appeal of Nov. 19th, 1794. The following are a few of the instances: *Centinel*, Dec. 27, 1794; *Worcester County Intelligencer*, Jan. 20, 27, 1795; *Farmer's Weekly Museum*, Feb. 10, 17, 1795; *Hampshire Gazette*, March 25, April 1, 1795; *Centinel*, Nov. 25, 1795; *Mass. Mercury*, Dec. 4, 1795; *Centinel*, Dec. 12, 1795; *Mass. Mercury*, Feb. 12, 1796; *Centinel*, July 23, 1796; *Mass. Spy*, Dec. 14, 1796; *Centinel*, Jan. 4, 1797; *Western Star*, Jan. 15, 1798; *Greenfield Gazette*, Nov. 3, 1798; *Centinel*, Nov. 21, Dec. 26, 29, 1798.

(85) So zealous had the Salem *Gazette* (Aug. 25, 1795) reports: "Complaints from Troy [N. Y.] are that the missionaries sent from Connecticut, discover more of the designs of Party, than of promoting the Gospel of peace."

chusetts and New England, driving them from the national current into an eddy of morbid provincialism which nearly caused them to be swallowed up in the quicksand of treason.

CHAPTER IX.

THE GROWTH OF THE FEDERALIST PARTY IN MASSACHUSETTS, 1793-1796.

The death of Hancock, on October 8th, 1793, left the state government in the hands of the lieutenant-governor, Samuel Adams. It brought to a close the career of a man who was possessed to an unusual degree of the affections of the people. An aristocrat born and bred, he was affable and familiar with all men, and satisfied democratic susceptibilities by the fine appearance he made at the head of the state government, with his open house, unbounded hospitality and lavish generosity.¹ In the decade after the Revolution, which so abounded in democratic feeling, this magnificent "pageant" dazzled the state with his patriotic pose and his attachment to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. No son of that state ever aroused more devotion in the people, merited it less, or has been so thoroughly forgotten by later generations.

This is likewise the close of the epoch of purely personal leadership and the beginning of party machinery and the era of party government, which became comparatively well developed by the close of the century. Instead of a leader with a small coterie of personal friends about him, who was supported, generally speaking, for his patriotism rather than his policies, men were nominated because in a very large measure they represented national parties.²

(1) "The manners of the Governor were peculiarly insinuating. His enemies would oft times see him, and their enmity would cease.—He was a gentleman; and possessed a most happy talent of adapting his conversation to the taste of all." *Centinel*, Oct. 28, 1793. For the evidence of his popularity see e. g. *Salem Gazette*, Aug. 13, 30, 1785; *Mass. Gazette*, April 6, June 19, 1787; *Centinel*, Jan. 7, March 18, 1786.

(2) This is exemplified by Samuel Adams, who represents the transition period. Elected at first by the Hancockian party, supported by his well deserved repu-

In addition, Hancock's death gave the federalists a chance to elect a man of their own sentiments. Repeated failures had showed them the utter hopelessness of inducing the people to cease from worshipping their idol, Hancock. But Samuel Adams was a far different proposition. He had suffered eclipses in the people's favor, although only when he was under the cloud of Hancock's displeasure. But the federalists, hoping against hope that the governor's mantle had not fallen upon the lieutenant-governor, determined to put up a candidate whom they vainly trusted would "unite all hearts"³ and who was not "the leader of any party."⁴ In the Hon. William Cushing, late Chief Justice of the Supreme Judicial Court of the state, some of the federalists, although there is no use made of that name, fondly believed they had found the right man. He was nominated by a "number of persons [of Boston] . . . and various parts of the Commonwealth, met for the purpose to the choice of their fellow-citizens, a man who might be the most deserving of their suffrages." Their "unanimous opinion" was in favor of the above gentleman.⁵ Desirous of adding strength to their ticket, Samuel Adams was added informally a week later, as lieutenant-governor.⁶ The attempt was hardly a success and tardy likewise, for the friends of Adams had already nominated him for governor, with Nathaniel Gorham as lieutenant-governor.⁷

tation for patriotism, which pulled him through in 1796, he soon began to represent the views of the Republican party. His opponents were strictly party men, federalists who received their support, especially in 1796 and after, largely because of their political affiliations.

(3) *Centinel*, March 22, 1794. Cushing had been mentioned several times for governor in 1789. See *Centinel*, March 7, 14, 21, 1789.

(4) *Ibid.*, March 1, 1794; *Western Star*, March 25, 1794.

(5) *Centinel*, March 1, 1794. The intention of the federalists to run Cushing had been taken some time before. C. Gore to King, Boston, Dec. 24, 1793. King: King, I:511. A Boston caucus nominated him again. *Centinel*, March 28, 1794.

(6) *Ind. Ch.*, March 6, 1794; *Centinel*, March 8, 1794.

(7) *Ibid.*, March 5, 1794. Gorham was a very moderate federalist. Politically he seems to have had little in common with the Federalist party. He was a friend of Hancock (see p. 65, n. 52). He had quite a personal following and often received many votes, but always lost the election.

Many others were nominated by friends, for the two offices in question.⁸ There are no less than eight, willingly or unwillingly, entered in the gubernatorial race, while for second honors there are likewise eight.⁹ Nothing could bring out more plainly the lack of definite parties than this large number of nominees. The confusion is clear evidence that the old system of personal parties still lingered—Adams, nominated as governor and lieutenant-governor by supposedly opposite parties, the Cushing ticket having various names attached to it by personal partisans. Another indication of the lack of definiteness in parties is the impartial acceptance by the Centinel of presumably republican tickets and eulogies.¹⁰ The canvass proceeded without great outward asperity,¹¹ although the fact that it was believed that Adams was connected directly or indirectly with the hated Constitutional Club of Boston aroused some strictures.¹² On the other hand, the “bugbear of State Suability” was used industriously against Cushing,¹³ for the people are

(8) Gerry was nominated for governor, likewise Samuel Phillips. Centinel, March 15; Bowdoin for lieutenant-governor, Adams for governor, *ibid*, March 26; Adams lieutenant-governor, *ibid*, March 15; Gorham and T. Russell likewise. The official tickets as slated by Boston caucuses were Cushing as governor and Adams as his lieutenant on one (This on March 28th. *Ibid*, March 29.)—the other was Adams and Moses Gill on March 25th. *Ibid*, March 26, 1794.

(9) Mass. Mercury, March 25, 1794.

(10) Centinel, March 22, 26, 29, April 2, 5, 1794.

(11) Very little interest is manifested in western Massachusetts. There is a calm notice that Cushing “is nominated in the Eastern Counties for Governor,” but that is about all the political campaigning there is in the western newspapers. Hampshire Gazette, April 2, 1794. Still in the eastern part some electioneering activity is shown by the discussions concerning the law covering the suffrage qualifications. See e. g. Centinel, April 5, 1794.

(12) See e. g. Mass. Mercury, March 21, April 2, 1794. Other accusations as outlined in the Centinel, April 2, 1794, were (1) Unfriendly to the Federal Government; (2) a bitter enemy to Hancock, his “late appearance of friendship feigned to answer his views;” (3) his severity towards the misguided people engaged in the rebellion; (4) that he has “directly and indirectly been counteracting the proceedings of the President respecting the disgraced Genet,” (this charge is substantiated by a letter—marked by indiscreetness if nothing else—of Adams to Genet, written October 22nd, 1793, being two months after his recall had been demanded by Washington); (5) he “readily” issued orders to call out the militia to celebrate the successes of the French, such being a contravention of the decree of neutrality; (6) finally his great age was considered to militate against his usefulness.

(13) Ind. Ch., March 6, 1794; Centinel, March 1, 1794. The only important accusation against Cushing was that he had delivered an opinion in favor of the

informed by his friends that that question is quite dead, since Congress has "annihilated it" by a "very great majority." "Let the tale not deceive you."¹⁴

Cushing himself appears quite indifferent, for he writes to his friend, Increase Sumner: "Entre Nous, some gentlemen have proposed to me to stand for the first magistracy of our State; but many weighty reasons prompted me to decline..." and he seems to have the general attitude of the State when he says: "There is our good lieutenant-governor, who stands in the direct line of promotion, and who has waded through a sea of political troubles and grown old and labored for the good of his country."¹⁵

The result of the election was a handsome victory for Samuel Adams,¹⁶ the vote standing 14,465 to 7,159.¹⁷ This was in some respects distinctly encouraging to the federalists, for their candidate had to

suability of Massachusetts. Centinel, March 22, 29, 1794. See also *ibid.*, July 17, 1793. This occasioned much excitement the year before, 1793. The decision of the United States Supreme Court led Hancock to issue a proclamation on July 9th [Centinel, July 13, 1793] calling together the legislature in extra session on September 18th. The report of the committee which had been appointed the previous session "in order that...such measures [be] adopted...as...honour and interest may demand and the peace and safety of the Union required" (*Ibid.*, March 23, 1793.) was accepted and a resolve which passed the Senate on September 23rd, was concurred in by the House on September 27th and received the Governor's signature on the same date. Centinel, Sept. 28, 1793. The resolution declared that it would be "inexpedient; and in its exercise, dangerous to the peace, safety, and independence of the several states..." *Ibid.*, Sept. 28, 1793. See also *ibid.*, March 23, July 13, 31, Sept. 21, 1793. In the last is the Governor's speech to the legislature.

(14) Centinel, March 22, 1794.

(15) N. E. Hist. Gen. Reg., April, (1854) pp. 117-8.

(16) As governor, this democratic gentleman felt impelled, or at least his friends induced him, to adopt a certain modest degree of style which went to the extreme of "servants in Livery." S. Breck to Knox, June 1, 1794. Knox MSS. XXXV:122. In one respect at least, his attitude changed considerably. "It is presumed," writes a satirical correspondent, "...that the two branches of the Legislature will be exceedingly careful about answering the Speech of [Adams]...lest they should give offense...[since he as] a member of the Senate...[thought] it was improper for Speeches to be made from the Chair, and he uniformly and pointedly opposed answering them...[but] the more we aim at the principles of 'Liberty' and 'Equality' the stronger we feel attached to MON-ARCHIAL FORMS AND CEREMONIES." Centinel, Jan. 25, 1794.

(17) For lieutenant-governor, the four candidates, who had received the largest number of votes, were S. Adams, Moses Gill, Nathaniel Gorham, Elbridge Gerry. The House sent up the names of Gill and Gorham. The senate elected the former unanimously. Centinel, May 31, 1794.

carry the burden of having delivered the United States Supreme Court's decision of state suability, which was so thoroughly resented in Massachusetts. The fact that he was a federal office holder was another heavy handicap. The fear of federal interference and control of the states, by allowing incumbents of national offices places in the state legislature, was universal.¹⁸ This decisive victory is interesting if viewed from another standpoint. Dividing the state into three parts the figures show what a striking difference there is between the popularity of the successful candidate in the different sections. In the eastern portion the vote stands 7,175 to 3,326; in the west 3,643 to 3,040, while the Maine section gives 3,647 to 793. It is quite probable however that it is not at all the strength of federalist feelings in the west which resulted in the remarkably close vote, but hostility toward Samuel Adams, begotten of his alleged harsh attitude toward the insurgents in Shays' Rebellion. This charge was made at that time,¹⁹ was repeated in his successful attempt to oust Lincoln from the lieutenant-governorship in 1789, and was the accusation more generally used in the present campaign.²⁰ This belief gains added confirmation when it is known that Berkshire County—the seat of the only serious contest of the rebellion and where even “two thirds of the people and property” were involved²¹—is the solitary one to give a

(18) See the vote on this question in the *Herald of Freedom*, Jan. 29, 1790.

(19) “Last year [1786] the ship was steered by a good old weather beaten firm patriot [Bowdoin] who held the helm steady, and would not mind the noise of the crew, who would have brought the ship upon the rocks. He was too wise and too honest. So he was thrown overboard. And now they have had a complaisant pilot [Hancock]—he has eased away and let..drive: but..he seems to be bringing her into port, where the landlord will call upon the seamen for their old scores, so he must be thrown overboard..And the boatswain [Adams] a fierce fellow, who a few months ago would have swung half the crew for their mutiny..must be put at the helm.” *Hampshire Gazette*, April 2, 1788.

(20) The address of the convention which nominated Cushing says this in so many words: “his humane conduct during the late insurrection..give him pretensions which are not united in any other individual.” *Centinel*, March 1, 1794.

(21) This charge was made on the strength of a statement by T. Sedgwick of Stockbridge. M. North to Knox, Springfield, Feb. 19, 1787. Knox MSS. XVIII:138.

majority against Adams, the vote being 696 to 429. And Berkshire is the least federalistic of the three western counties.

Besides the commotions in France and those aroused by her friends and agents in this country; the Constitutional Club added a factor which stirred the political cauldron to boiling more and more furiously. Their evident intention to take a hand in politics was early perceived and resented.²² "If report say true," was the comment of an indignant correspondent, "there are two Legislative Bodies now holding their sessions in B[oston]—one in the State House, and the other in *Equality Alley*. The Legislature of Massachusetts ought to feel themselves much *relieved* by the voluntary service of a New Club, who...are endeavouring, by every artifice to involve America in war."²³ Their first open move was to stir up great excitement over a speech of Samuel Dexter in Congress, concerning the "carrying trade." The original sin was because he opposed Madison's resolutions in regard to commerce, which the federalists charged were for the purpose of causing war between the United States and Great Britain. This anti-"Maddisonian" position in itself would not have been sufficient to provoke any amount of resentment in his home state, had not Balch, editor of the Philadelphia Aurora, falsified his speech by omissions and additions, which made the speaker assert the direct contrary of what he actually did affirm. This mutilated edition was immediately copied into the Chronicle and the trouble began.²⁴ A town meeting was called for by the fomenters of the agitation, in order "to intimidate your members

(22) Centinel, Jan. 17, 1794.

(23) Centinel, Jan. 17, 1794.

(24) Ibid, Feb. 26, 1794. "[B. Austin] who has for years run an unsuccessful race in competition with Mr. Ames, is now reduced to the contemptible shift of .print[ing].. in Capitals and Italicks,..detached portions of.. [Ames'] public speeches.." Ibid, Feb. 1, 1794.

from opposing it [*i. e.* the resolution of Madison.] . . . They [the French faction] even . . . affirm, that by this means they are sure of taking off two [Ames and Dexter] of them."²⁵ The political purpose of this town meeting was too thinly disguised to delude the discerning,²⁶ but the "real merchants of the town" perceived the futility of opposing the favorite method of the Boston inhabitants of airing their ideas and grievances at a town meeting.²⁷ It was held on the 13th of February. Much eloquence, many arguments and a few facts were forcibly presented by Democratic orators.²⁸ Their opponents contented themselves with asserting the impossibility of the alleged speech of Dexter. A committee was appointed to get at the facts of the case and the meeting was adjourned to February 24th. Meanwhile, despite the Chronicle's various assertions,²⁹ the absolute denials by the Centinel began to have their effect.³⁰ And when the appointed day came even the very mild resolutions recommended by the committee were lost by a "large majority" after a fight which consumed all day, including an adjournment to the Old South Meeting House from Faneuil Hall—owing to the crowd—and a postponing of the vote to the next day.³¹

(25) *Ibid.*, Feb. 19, 1794. This was the second resolution of Madison.

(26) *Ibid.*, Feb. 12, 1794.

(27) The "Charlestown Jacobins," as was usual, immediately followed the example set by their Boston brethren. *Ind. Ch.*, Feb. 22, 1794.

(28) *Ibid.*, Feb. 17, 1794.

(29) *Ibid.*, Feb. 17, 20, 22, 1794.

(30) Finally on the 24th, the Independent Chronicle admits that it is barely possible that some slight error has crept into its report for it says: "we shall be happy to convince our readers that our representatives spoke a language a little different," yet it bolsters up the faith of its readers by the assertion that the speech was taken from Bache's paper, "who has publicly vouched for the accuracy of the debates."

(31) There is a full account with comments of this stormy episode in the Centinel, Feb. 26th, 1794. Having triumphantly rescued Ames from the false charges, the federalists turned their attention to a writer named "America" in the Chronicle for the 10th of February, who "has been gully of the most flagrant falsehoods, and the most gross misrepresentation of the speeches" [of Goodhue in Congress]. Centinel, March 1, 5, 1794. To show how far from representing the sentiments of "the real merchants, traders and mechanics," these attempts of the republicans were; a petition was signed by 500 of such, representing seven-eighths of the commerce, against the proposed restrictions (in the town

The animosity between the two factions in Boston was nothing new, simply a revival of that which had its birth in the bitter and dangerous times of Shays' Rebellion and when the Bowdoinites and Hancockians fought together. Then it was that Benjamin Austin wrote those inflammatory articles under the signature of "Honestus" which are supposed to have been a factor in bringing about the uprising. He was now the "noted Jacobin scribbler...and brawler,"³³ a leading light in the Constitutional Club and the most constant contributor to the Independent Chronicle on political subjects of a controversial character. On the other side stood Stephen Higginson and his friends, the so-called "aristocrats and tories." He was a faithful opponent of the democrats and a staunch adherent of a strong government, one of the earliest and most consistent federalists. His activities and contributions to good government were rewarded by his being subjected to the most bitter and unsparing hatred and vilification from 1786 onwards.³⁴

An incident in September illustrates this feeling and at the same time the lawless and dangerous practises toward which the Constitutional Club was tending.³⁵ A veritable act of piracy was committed

meeting) and expressing full confidence in Ames and Goodhue. *Ibid.*, March 8, 1794. See also King: King I:547.

(32) Such a parable as the following, with its interpretation attached, discovers the lack of amiable feelings: "'Onestus,' a Rope maker [this was the business of 'Honestus' i. e. B. Austin] in Hell, had an Ass always standing by him, who as fast as he twisted the cord, bit it asunder. 'Onestus' resembles, those hellish Ministers, who through their evil councils make Ropes to bind the people in slavery. By the Ass is meant the honest patriot...who destroys his schemes..." *Mass. Mercury*, Jan. 14, 1794.

(33) *Centinel*, Oct. 22, 1794.

(34) See e. g. *Ind. Ch.*, Aug. 22, 1787; *Centinel*, Aug. 3, 10, 1793; *Ind. Ch.*, Aug. 6, 10, 13, 1795. *Ibid.*, April 18, 1796; June 26, 1797; July 5, 1798. To the republicans Higginson typifies all that they are opposed to. He sums up in one word "Laco"—all their antipathies. In the *Centinel*, Aug. 15, 1787, an enemy of Higginson thus addresses him: "Stephen, you are...a junto infinitely more infamous than those under Bernard and Hutchinson...I saw Stephen at a certain office...grinning ghastly a horrible smile; his eye darting at once, triumph, terror and treachery...[he] ought to be burnt for sedition, treason, stratagem and spoils..." and the writer winds up with the usual demand for a town meeting.

(35) Even Sullivan found the club too radical and deemed it best to resign "publicly," "disapproving of their extreme views." *Amory: Sullivan*, I:275.

under its instigation and superintendence when a schooner, bound for Halifax, was pursued by a boat from the *La Concorde*, forcibly boarded, and letters and papers from Boston merchants stolen.³⁶ This high-handed measure naturally aroused bitter comments: "The 'INSURGENT CLUB,' not content with raising a STANDING ARMY at Pittsburg, have even established a NAVY—some of the sweet fruits of these *blessed* clubs on the sea shore, have appeared."³⁷

The growth of political excitement and interest is shown in the fall Congressional elections. The newspapers in October are full of the canvassing that is going on.³⁸ The candidates of both parties suffer the most rabid attacks.³⁹ A private letter of the Rev. Jedediah Morse reflects the feelings of the exasperated friends of Ames and Dexter who were hard pressed by the skilful and somewhat unscrupulous campaign of the opposition.⁴⁰ "It is melancholy," he writes to Oliver Wolcott, "to find how much, & how deeply, the mutilated speeches of Messrs. A[mes] and D[exter] published in the *prostituted* Chronicle have *poisoned* the minds of the people, of but little discernment. . . Their re-election. . . is doubtful. . ."⁴¹ These two, however, were returned by the election on November 3rd⁴² and with them Sedgwick,

His good faith in this step was loudly impugned by a writer in the *Centinel*, Jan. 29th, 1794.

(36) *Ibid.* Sept. 6, 1794. Perez Morton (president of the club) was accused of instigating this outrage, which occurred on September 3rd, and was brought to trial. *Ibid.* Sept. 10, 1794. The pilot of the boat, which captured the sloop *Success*, was likewise tried on the eighth of the same month. *Hampshire Gazette*, Oct. 1, 1794. See also *Mass. Mercury*, Sept. 16, and *Am. Apollo*, Sept. 11, 1794.

(37) *Centinel*, Sept. 9, 1794.

(38) *Am. Apollo*, Oct. 23, 1794.

(39) *Centinel*, Oct. 22, 31, 1794.

(40) *Ind. Ch.*, Oct. 22, 1794; *Centinel*, Oct. 29, 1794.

(41) Charlestown, Oct. 15, 1794. Wolcott MSS., Conn. Hist. Soc. Fisher Ames was quite of the same opinion. For he writes to O. Wolcott from Dedham, Nov. 14, 1796: "Here the influence of the Boston Chronicle and the orations in the market, is most pestiferous. I have proclaimed open war against all this, but a rover against the stream soon grows weak and weary." Gibbs: *Memoirs* I:393. A strong defense of Ames is found in the *Centinel*, Oct. 22, 1794.

(42) *Centinel*, Nov. 5, 1794.

who had likewise been the target for abuse and opposition.⁴³ The following year the federalists lay low, watching the trend of events, and making no attempt to contest the annual election for governor in the spring.⁴⁴ That most formidable agency in New England for making and directing public opinion, the clergy, was beginning to preach federalism in the pulpit and out, on the Sabbath and week days likewise. With the powerful aid of this order, it would be a mere matter of time when their party could seize the reins of the state government.

Not only did "the sentiments of the clergy this way (for so far as I am acquainted he (Mr. Osgood) speaks the sentiments of nine out of ten of the clergy) agree with those of the President...in respect to the *self-created Societies* [and]... The

(43) *Ibid.*, Nov. 19, 1794. Sedgwick won by a bare majority of 61 votes. In the Hampshire district the federalist sought to oust William Lyman, a republican. The campaign in that district began early, for in the Hampshire Gazette, June 4, 11, 25, 1794, (the last from the Fed. Spy) there are two articles defending him and answering accusations. In *ibid.*, Oct. 29, the paper is crowded with nine electioneering puffs. His opponent was Gen. William Shepherd, who had served well in Shays' Rebellion as well as in the Revolution. The latter was barely defeated. Hampshire Gazette, Nov. 12, 1794. See Ames to T. Dwight, Works, pt. 1, p. 158, for the disgust of Ames over Lyman's victory. The "funded debt" seemed to be a handle much used in favor of Lyman. Hampshire Gazette, Oct. 29, 1794.

That party animosity was fully aroused, is evident from the loud clamor over illegal voting by the worsted democrats. *Ind. Ch.*, Nov. 6, 1794. The reply is, that if it is true that there are only 2132 legal voters in Boston, from whence came the 2301 votes cast at the spring election for governor, there being no objections registered at that time by the democrats. *Centinel*, Nov. 8, 1794. Besides "There are those who can testify a number of Frenchmen, wearing the national cocarde..did actually vote for Dr. Jarvis [the republican nominee]; besides journeymen who had a day's play [pay] for going down to vote." *Ibid.*, Nov. 19, 1794. These journeymen would not have the property qualification entitling them to the suffrage. However Madison writes to Jefferson, Dec. 21, 1794, Works, II:29: "Ames is said to owe his success to the vote of Negroes and British sailors, smuggled under a very lax mode of conducting the election there. Sedgwick and Goodhue have bare majorities." The suffrage qualifications were "a male inhabitant of the town wherein he resides, of twenty-one years and upwards, and having a freehold estate within the Commonwealth of the annual income of three pounds, or any estate of the value of £60." Since the law at that time demanded no oath by the voter, as was previously required, the books of the assessors were the only means of ascertaining the legal voters. Hence great abuses arose. *Centinel*, April 5, 1794.

The abuses seem to have persisted. The Hampshire Gazette, Oct. 8, 1800, remarks: "one of the warm Democrats conveyed a piece of land to a worthless fellow, sufficient to make him a Freeman..the new Freeman owed some old debts to the Federalists..[and] before the patriotic Grantor had time to procure the land reconveyed to himself, secured their debts by attaching it." A gold watch sufficed to qualify numbers of impecunious democrats.

(44) The federalist congressmen wished that Increase Sumner be opposed to Adams. F. Ames to T. Dwight, Phila., Feb. 3, 1795. Works, pt. 1, p. 165.

thanksgiving sermons in Boston & its vicinity (with only two or three exceptions) all breathe... the same spirit;—though their manner was not so particular & pointed....” but also the rest of “the clergy in this commonwealth, [who] generally approve of the same sentiments.”⁴⁵ Fisher Ames writes from Philadelphia in exultation: “Mr. Osgood’s sermon is extolled... The heathen in this state, and farther south, ought to have him sent as a missionary... The proclamation by the President, for a Thanksgiving will afford an opening for other Clergymen to seek glory.”⁴⁶ And so it did. Quite a famous number definitely announced their conversion to federalism by their sermons that day. Again Jedediah Morse sent encouraging news to his friend Wolcott: “The National Thanksgiving has done a vast deal of good in a *political view* this way. All the sermons which have been published (& they are numerous) have, as far as I have heard, spoke the language of Federalism except Mr. Bradford’s... ”⁴⁷ And Fisher Ames quite correctly concludes from his correspondents that “The Thanksgiving has helped tone the public mind.”⁴⁸ And he gives an interesting illuminating cause when he says “Tom Paine has kindly cured our clergy of their prejudices.”⁴⁹

The lack of a spring campaign does not indicate that a sudden lull had come in this stirring period.

(45) J. Morse to O. Wolcott, Charlestown, Dec. 17, 1794. Quoted in Love: Fast and Thanksgiving Days of N. E., pp. 366-7.

(46) To T. Dwight, Jan. 7, 1795. Works, pt. 1, p. 160. D. Sewell to C. Strong [then U. S. Senator] York, Jan. 26, 1795: “Our general Court are in Session, from the Speech & the Senate’s Answer—Things look Well; Whether Mr. Osgood’s Thanksgiving Sermon. has had a good effect upon the chair or not, I am unable to say, But if one might Guess, that, or something else, had done good. And a Proclama. making public, the President’s for a Thanksgiving is done with a good Grace. This Business, in Gov. Hancock’s day, from some cause or other, was quite awkwardly performed.” Strong MSS., Forbes Library, Northampton, Mass.

(47) Charlestown, March 18, 1795. Quoted in Love: Fast and Thanksgiving Days of N. E., pp. 371-2.

(48) To C. Gore, Phila., Feb. 24, 1795. Works, pt. 1, p. 168. The same day he writes to T. Dwight more explicitly: “The Thanksgiving has keyed up the public mind to federalism.” Ibid, p. 169.

(49) Ibid, p. 168.

Far from it. This summer saw the publication of the *Jacobiniad*, a witty but a most cutting and bitter satire on the democrats supposed to have been written by Dr. J. S. J. Gardiner.⁵⁰ Another of the same sort, called "*The Lyars*," provoked angry resentment. It produced a riot and an attack upon the editor, who vainly sought to avoid chastisement—by a horsewhip in the hands of the son of one of the pilloried unfortunates—by ignominiously taking to his heels after flourishing a pistol.⁵¹ But the uproar over Jay's Treaty exceeded any noise made yet by the brazen-lunged opponents of the administration. Town-meeting after town-meeting protested and stormed.⁵² So carried away were the people with unreasoning passion, that Jedediah Morse accurately described the situation when he wrote, just after the Charlestown town-meeting, "The present is truly a most important & delicate crisis. The passions of people were never warmer

(50) It was published under the title *Remarks on the Jacobiniad*, Revised and Corrected by the Author, and Embellished with Caricatures. [Boston, 1795.] The *Federal Orrery*, in eleven numbers, printed the *Jacobiniad* entire, with thorough annotations, lest any obscure passage remain in doubt or any character mentioned remain unknown, April 6, 10, 13, 16, 20, 23, 27, 30; May 4, 7, 11, 1795. The democrats believed it was Dr. Gardiner, for they assailed him fiercely. *Ind. Ch.*, Jan. 12, 1795. Much displeasure was expressed by those who were thus pilloried for the derision of their enemies. *Ind. Ch.*, April 30, 1795. Some left his church, among them B. Austin, the democrats calling the succeeding brethren "abundant" in numbers, the federalists "three." *Mass. Mercury*, May 29, 1795. The *Hartford Wits* were exercising their ingenuity in making the Boston democrats ridiculous, and the federalist papers hastened to print the clever and galling poems. See "*The Echo*, number 18," in the *Fed. Orrery*, Aug. 20th, 27th, 1795, from the *Conn. Courant*; also "*The Poem on the Treaty and the Meeting over it at Boston*," *Impartial Herald*, Aug. 22, Sept. 1, 1795, from the *Conn. Courant*. The "*Guillotine*; or, *The annual Song of the Tenth Muse*" was republished from the *Conn. Courant* in the *Fed. Orrery*, Jan. 7, 1796; *Mass. Spy*, Jan. 20, 1796. See also *The Democratiad*.. *Phila.*, 3rd ed., 1796.

(51) J. Pierce to Knox, Boston, Sept. 15, 1795, Knox MSS. XXXVIII:23. See also *Fed. Orrery*, Sept. 10, 1795; *Brookfield Advertiser*, Sept. 16, 1795.

(52) A Boston town meeting held on the 10th of July, adjourned to the 13th. See 27th Report of the Record Commissioners of Boston, pp. 264-5. The resolutions passed, were forwarded to the President in hopes that he "may not have signed it, and if not that he will be deterred. this. [is] a Jacobin measure disapproved by all good men, and not countenanced by any merchant of eminence, not by ten in all. [The unreasoning course of action taken is fully explained:] "the general vote of disapprobation was taken without reading or hearing the Treaty: even at the adjournment. it was read only for form's sake, but not discussed previous to adopting [the] long objections to it. . . Mr. Franklin Bache. . . came on here with. . . a large collection of Lies. . . to create a flame here and to urge our common people to excesses. in one Week We shall be cool and composed here;" S. Higginson to T. Pickering, Boston, July 14, 1795. *Am. Hist.*

since the year '75—'⁵³ And that seasoned observer of the trend of political sentiment, Stephen Higginson, observed: "I think the present moment a very critical One with Our Country more so than any one that has passed..."⁵⁴ Boston effervesced all summer. Mobs seemed to be so common there that the Salem Gazette satirically remarks: "a body of Essex militia will soon be called for, to keep in check the spirit of riot and insurgency manifested by the Boston cits...." And again, in referring to these mobs: "The factious attempts of the Bostonians to govern the government render that town a very improper place for legislative deliberations. Should the treaty become law of the land, the town of Boston and Dracut are determined to detach themselves from the Union, and form a mighty, independent nation of themselves."⁵⁵

Assn. Rep. I (1896) 787-8. The federalists who did not attend this meeting met, and after drawing up a "Dissent to the Doings of this Town [signed by more than 200] and passing Resolutions by the Chamber of Commerce [August 7th] the former with the names, the latter without," forwarded both to the President. Same to same. *Ibid.*, pp. 790-1. Also T. Russel to Washington, Boston, Aug. 13, 1795. Sparks: Correspondence of the Revolution, IV:476-7. The reaction had set in by the middle of August for "one third at least of our Members of the Chamber, who have now voted with us, were at first misled; and perhaps a large proportion of the Dissenters to doings of the Town meeting, were even warm in opposition [previously] to the Treaty. The arrangements of the Jacobins were such, and so well formed, as to preclude all oppy. of opposing in this instance." S. Higginson to T. Pickering, Boston, Aug. 16, 1795. *Am. Hist. Assn. Rep. I*(1896)790-1. The wrath of a merchant, ordinarily of federalistic affiliations, is well expressed by the letter of S. Breck to Knox, Boston, July 7, 1795. Knox MSS. XXXVII:135: "for my own part I had rather see my Country in its last convulsions than submit to it..." [Jay's Treaty.] See also G. Cabot to King, Brookline, July 25. King: King, II:17; July 27, pp. 18-19; Aug. 4, pp. 20-1; Aug. 14, 1795, pp. 24-5; C. Gore to King, Boston, Aug. 7, 1795, pp. 21-2; Same to same, Waltham, Aug. 14, 1795, pp. 22-4. *Ibid.* The Boston agitators succeeded in exciting like commotions in a few of the other towns. Dracut protested on Aug. 3d. *Ind. Ch.*, Aug. 10, 13, 1795. Lexington disapproved on Aug. 13th. *Ibid.*, Sept. 21, 1795. A meeting (against which 72 people signed their names to a declaration, showing that it was not a legal town-meeting, *Mass. Mercury*, Nov. 17, 1795.) at Plymouth, Oct. 28th, reprobated the Treaty. *Ind. Ch.*, Nov. 2, 1795. The democrats adopted various devices to stir up the people (see e. g. *Ind. Ch.*, Sept. 3, 14, 1795.) even to threatening a civil war in case the Treaty was adopted. *Ibid.*, Aug. 17, 1795. The same paper, Feb. 4th, 1796, quotes from the *Phila. Aurora*: "it is hardly credible that the President will draw so deeply upon his remaining stock of popularity, as in opposition to the united voice of his constituents, to sign an instrument big with the fate of our internal peace and independence."

(53) To O. Wolcott, July 21, 1795. Wolcott MSS., Conn. Hist. Soc.

(54) To T. Pickering, Aug. 16, 1795. *Am. Hist. Assn. Rep. I*(1896)792-3.

(55) Sept. 15, 1795. See e. g. the *Western Star*, Aug. 4, 1795, for contemptuous remarks concerning the various mobs in the cities which presume to judge of the treaty without hearing it "crying away with it." This town of Dracut

The first of these lawless proceedings was instigated by a "number of incendiary Handbills" calling upon the people to take effective measures against an alleged British privateer, the *Betsy* of St. Croix, then lying at the Long Wharf.⁵⁶ The report of William Donnison is interesting. It seems that the only official action proposed by the supine authorities was to inquire of "Mr. Attorney Moreton" what action could be taken *against* the vessel following a complaint of the French consul. He continues: "receiving notice that some mischief was meditated against the Vessel, I went down the wharf with intent to inform the people that a regular proceeding was in operation. . . but . . . it was too late . . . the Vessel being nearly destroyed, and the tumult so great that all attempts to appease them would have been useless."⁵⁷ Emboldened by their success, the instigators again circulated on the 25th handbills "calling upon the good citizens to attack several English vessels laying at Goldburys Wharf. The Governor. . . took the most spirited measures. . . A detachment of militia. . . were mustered at the State House." However, after dark a large number gathered and dispersed only after the insistent persuasion of the magistrates.⁵⁸

was suspiciously republican, to the extent of furnishing "no less than 185 votes [at the last trial for representative] an increase of nearly 100. more than one in seven of the whole number of inhabitants. . ." *Centinel*, May 23, 1795.

(56) *Hampshire Gazette*, July 1, 1795. The mob seemed to have worked with care and thoroughness, for they first took off the captain and the crew, then threw overboard the guns and ammunition, small arms, cutlasses, etc. Finally they dismantled the vessel, pushed her off, after setting fire to her and the tide carried the boat to Charlestown, where she burned to the water's edge.

The Boston Selectmen vainly tried to have "Philip Woods, Printer, arrested for publishing & distributing [these] . . . inflammatory notification[s]." 27th Report of the Record Commissioners of . . . Boston, p. 263.

(57) To S. Adams, Boston, June 21, 1795. S. Adams MSS., N. Y. Public Library. The Governor offered a reward of \$500 for the discovery and bringing to justice of the leaders in this lawless proceeding. *Hampshire Gazette*, July 8, 1795.

(58) *Mass. Mercury*, June 26, 1795. Just a year later one man, only, was convicted for participation and fined by the Circuit Court of the United States to the amount of \$6,147. His property lacked \$600 of the requisite amount and hence he was sent to jail for six months. *Hampshire Gazette*, June 22, 1796. See his appeal to a charitable public in *ibid.* Dec. 28, 1796.

The most formidable of these lawless gatherings which occurred this year is known as the "Watermelon Mob" or "Frolic."⁵⁹ On the 4th of September the mob paraded in the evening with a figure representing Jay.⁶⁰ The next day, "Having procured another Jay, with a watermelon-shell head... to designate him from...the pumpkin-shell heads that surrounded him, they...paraded...the principal streets and through Winter Street, where Governor Adams resides,...they gave him three cheers while he stood at his window smiling most graciously and bowing...respectfully...every time they passed...they gave him a salute."⁶¹ After minor disorders, "On the 9th they burnt the effigy near Oliver's Dock..." The 10th was marked by a small mob which accomplished nothing. Excited by remarks inserted in the "Federal Orrery," the rioters assembled before the house of the editor, threw stones and brick bats and were fired upon for their attentions; one fellow being wounded. This resolute reception caused their hurried dispersal. On the 14th a great mob amused themselves with a bonfire in Liberty Square⁶² where "an attempt was made

(59) The term arose from the reply of Adams to a deputation of the solid citizens who applied to the governor for the calling out of the militia after the mob had had possession of the town for several days. His contemptuous refusal and his reference to the harmless character of the riotous actions, gave great offence at that time, for there had been those who had been greatly disturbed and in personal danger. This curious negligence in suppressing these anti-treaty mobbers was a charge used industriously against Adams the next spring. Such a verse as the following taken from a "Song of Liberty and Equality which ought to have been sung at Faneuil—Hall...on September 21st, the birthday of the French Republic..." shows this feeling as well as the growth of party feeling. Fed. Orrery, Sept. 28, 1795 :

"Now striving again for a fortunate chance,
To taste of the Freedom of France—of France
Stealing thro' alleys, and winding thro' lanes,
Our mob-loving p[ro]verno[r] marches in haste,
His eyes up to Heaven—his heart with the feast;
In anarchy's strain
Psalm-singing, and praying
He smiles at man-slaying—Hurra."

(60) The federalists fell upon the procession and wrested the image from the democrats. Hampshire Gazette, Sept. 30, 1795.

(61) Ibid, March 16, 1796. As the date of the paper shows, it is an account of these riots designed to injure Adams, who was a candidate for re-election. Stephen Higginson is accused of writing the account of the Watermelon Frolic. It was first written and published soon after the September occurrences. See Hampshire and Berkshire Chronicle, Nov. 16, 1795.

(62) Hampshire Gazette, Sept. 30, 1795.

to disperse them, but being too feeble it fail'd. Sheriff Allen—the attorney Genl. (Sullivan)—and several Justices of the peace were compelled to retreat after being roughly handled—the same evening Dr. Baird & several others were knocked down—feeble attempts to quell a mob serve but to increase & encourage it—but our executive—'⁶³ Finally an association of all the most respectable citizens organized and succeeded, with the aid of the civil authorities, in putting an end to the mobocratic rule.⁶⁴

Such proceedings did not commend democratic ideas or methods of government to men possessed of sense or property. It savored far more of French license than of American liberty. So threatening had been the attitude of this multitude, that some had left Boston fearing for their safety.⁶⁵ Would not Fisher Ames perceive in such the justification for his assertions when he wrote: "I could neither repress my indignation, nor disguise my contempt for the blindness and gullibility of the rich men who so readily lend their strength to the party which is thirsting for the contents of their iron chests... what can augur worse for our affairs than to see men of wealth and at least reputed sense, openly acting against the doings of the Executive."⁶⁶ This was during the excitement over Jay's Treaty and the unbearable robberies of the English, when Boston merchants learned what it was to have "two British Ships of War and a Bermudian Privateer" calmly take up headquarters in Boston Bay and "take every thing that comes in their way."⁶⁷ Such experiences ought to excuse these "rich men of reputed sense" for losing patience.

(63) J. Pierce to Knox, Boston, Sept. 15, 1795, Knox MSS. XXXVIII:23.

(64) Amory: Sullivan, I:300-1.

(65) Hampshire Gazette, March 23, 1796.

(66) F. Ames to O. Wolcott, Dedham, July 9, 1795. Gibbs: Memoirs, I:210.

(67) S. Breck to Knox, Boston, July 7, 1795. Knox MSS. XXXVII:135. This same merchant complained of having a ship of his from France taken by these vessels loaded with "Wine, brandy, & Ingots of Silver and sent as prize to Halifax." Ibid.

Jay's Treaty was not popular however it was viewed. But the "grinding necessities" of a young and comparatively feeble country appealed to the sober conviction of the conservative classes who rallied for the defence of the Administration. In this the clergy, have thrown in their lot with the friends of Washington, bore a notable part and were destined to be even more active later. A striking tribute to their prowess is a letter of Knox to Washington, September 2nd, 1795: "Great unanimity...among the most respectable Class of people the Clergy of this State in favor of the principle and practise of Government this is expressed unequivocally in their conversation⁶⁸ and sermons with immense effect."⁶⁹

The Thanksgiving day,⁷⁰ appointed by the Governor, was still further improved, especially by the famous Rev. David Osgood.⁷¹ Of this last the faithful chronicler Jedidiah Morse said: "It is the same tune in a higher key."⁷² The astute politician and statesman, Fisher Ames, had kept fully informed of the political revolution, which, under the stimulating leadership of the clergy, was proceeding so rapidly throughout the state; for he asserts in a jubilant tone: "The people are coming right. I send you a sermon, which I wish our friends...may see...and get it (the political part) published..."⁷³ And an irritated Frenchman affirms—significantly with the emphasis placed on "the pulpit"—"in my last

(68) The word is doubtful in the original letter.

(69) Knox MSS. XXXVIII:9.

(70) It is noted in the *Western Star*, (for Nov. 3, 1795) that the Governor in his proclamation of October 14th, did not repeat his error of the previous year in omitting all reference to the Federal Government.

(71) The democrats affected to ignore this sermon, referring to it casually as "so contemptible that it is not even introduced as published at the request of his hearers." *Ind. Ch.*, Dec. 3, 1795. The federalists described it as "brine with a vengeance for sore backs." *Salem Gazette*, Dec. 8, 1795.

(72) To O. Wolcott, Charlestown, Dec. 3, 1795. *Love: Fast and Thanksgiving Days of N. E.*, p. 373.

(73) To O. Wolcott, Dedham, Dec. 31, 1795. Gibbs: *Memoirs*, I:296. D. Sewell to C. Strong, York, Dec. 27, 1795: "I am inclined to think that by far the larger part of Massa. district have different Sentiments from those of Dracut, Charlestown and some other hasty uninformed corporations..." Strong MSS., Forbes Library, Northampton, Mass.

I informed you...I should treat of the injury [to] ...liberty...in some parts of America, from the *Pulpit*, the Theatre, and the Press... They [the clergy] under a pretence of supporting religion engaged against our Revolution and even in their addresses to heaven, implicated and dishonoured the *natural rights of man*, and advocated the cause of Despotism."⁷⁴

Hardly had the year—1796—begun, when two occurrences showed how strongly the tide of federalism was running.⁷⁵ First, the Virginia Resolutions, to the indignation of the republicans, suffered very quick defeat and none too courteous treatment at the hands of the Massachusetts legislature.⁷⁶ Overwhelmingly rejected in the Senate, they fared little better in the House. A motion to commit was lost, 24 to 56. They were then laid on the table,⁷⁷ 42 to 41, and on February 6th the amendments were finally killed by a vote of 98 to 46, in an attempt to reconsider the tabling motion.⁷⁸

The other was the tart reply of both branches of the legislature to the Governor's message, in which

(74) Ind. Ch., Dec. 28, 1795. The other two letters of this series are in Dec. 21st, 1795, and Jan. 4th, 1796. It is highly significant to have "the pulpit," which is carefully emphasized, head the list of the agencies antagonistic to France.

(75) The action taken by the General Court was quite different from what had been hoped for by the republicans. On July 10, 1795, Robert Livingstone had written to Adams suggesting that he write Washington against Jay's Treaty—having done so himself—and suggested that if the legislature of Massachusetts would only pass resolutions against it that such action would have great weight. S. Adams MSS., N. Y. Public Library.

(76) Madison perceived the change of sentiment in Massachusetts when he wrote to Jefferson: "Their unhandsome treatment of the Virginia amendments portends a counter tone." Phila., Jan. 31, 1796, Works, II:75-6. He complains again of the treatment as "unworthy" in a letter to E. Pendleton, Phila., Feb. 7, 1796, Works, II:77-9. The republicans in Massachusetts were likewise irritated. See Ind. Ch., Jan. 25, Feb. 8, 1796. In the same paper (Feb. 4.) a correspondent does not think it respectful "to pass over the application of our Elder Sister...[who] joined hands with us to break that formidable TUSK of aristocracy, the suability of the states." The federalists on the other hand were greatly delighted and exulted: "the Legislatures of Massachusetts and New York and the Senate of Pennsylvania, have decided against the 'Virginia alteration.' Disorganizers! What think ye of the 'organs of the people,' now?" Centinel, Feb. 20, 1796.

(77) This was on the 19th of January. Ibid, Jan. 20, 1796.

(78) Ibid, Feb. 6, 1796. Comments in ibid, Feb. 10. So important is the vote that the names are given in full in ibid, Feb. 6; Ind. Ch., Feb. 11, 1796.

he criticised Jay's Treaty.⁷⁹ Although it was currently believed and openly asserted (while the unusual delay gave considerable color to the charge)⁸⁰ that the speech had been thus unduly long in coming because of the necessity of its being "much softened," yet it elicited sharp answers. To the governor's assertion⁸¹ that "the Treaty...was pregnant with evil,"⁸² the Senate replied: "We consider it an interference with the powers entrusted to that government for the Legislature of this Commonwealth to decide on [Jay's Treaty]... And having firm reliance on the Supreme Executive and other constituted authorities of the Union, we hope the apprehensions of danger expressed by your Excellency, on this subject, will never be realized."⁸³ The reply of the House was quite as much of a bitter slap. "We consider a respectful submission to the legal decisions of the constituted authorities to be the surest means of enjoying and perpetuating the invaluable blessings of our free and republican government."⁸⁴ It is no wonder that Fisher Ames writes gleefully, "Massachusetts has given faction a blow by the answer[s]...and the contempt of Virginia's revolutionary amendments."⁸⁵

Another cheering omen, to the federalists, was the death at Philadelphia of the parent "Jacobin Club." After chronicling that happy event, the federalist

(79) Even Madison remarked to Jefferson: "Govr. Adams has launched a pretty bold attack against the Treaty." Phila., Jan. 31, 1796. Works, II:76; see also C. Gore to King, Boston, Jan. 31, 1796. King: King, II:55.

(80) Centinel, Jan. 20, 1796. F. Ames to J. Smith, Dedham, Jan. 18, 1796, Works, pt. 1, pp. 183-4: "Our Governor has not yet delivered his most democratic speech, although it is the second week of the court-sitting. It is said, he has twice or thrice new modelled his preaching, as he was led by hopes and fears of the temper of the members, finding no anti-treaty stuff would be well received..."

(81) Centinel, Jan. 17, 20, 1796.

(82) A writer in the Centinel (Jan. 23, 1796) unkindly reminded the governor that "during the glorious revolution he thought things 'pregnant with evil,' which proved the salvation of our country, as also our Constitution was once highly pregnant with evil."

(83) The reply was on Jan. 21st. Centinel, Jan. 23, 1796.

(84) The reply was returned on Jan. 22d. Ibid., Jan. 27, 1796.

(85) To T. Dwight, Phila., Feb. 11, 1796. Works, pt. 1, p. 186.

paper remarks: "In Massachusetts a celebrated physician...has declared...that the club of Boston was in a languishing and decrepit state."⁸⁶ High hopes arose in the breast of some of the federalists over the chance of turning out the "aged and decrepit Sam,"⁸⁷ as they ungratefully regarded the patriot, who should have been respected for his well ripened years and great services to his country.

The attempt began early in February with a campaign document designed to injure Adams,⁸⁸ the logical nominee of the republicans, although Sullivan is nominated by his friends, doubtless encouraged by the federalists who were hoping in this way to divide

(86) The publication of Adet's intercepted letter concerning the Democratic Societies served but to give the *coup de grâce* to these moribund organizations. Still it furnished ammunition for the federalists. Said one writer: "Republicans are, according to this Frenchman, preparing our explosion of the government—see section 2—who were preparing a Revolution or Civil War—see section 13, 14—who form popular societies, who concentrate themselves and send out a concert of declarations against the government—section 8, section 10—[he] vindicates the whiskey rebellion, and calls them Republicans by principle, and independent by character and situation, the same men whom the Chronicle smoothly noticed while they had arms in their hands, as their brethren." Centinel, Jan. 20, 1796.

(87) The following quotation from the Centinel, Jan. 17, 1795, taken from the "Hartford News-Boy," will show how the Governor had lost confidence and even the respect of the federalists for his open devotion to the cause of the French. [This attachment was so notorious earlier that when Prince Edward visited Boston, officialdom was greatly agitated by his delay over waiting upon the acting governor. See S. Breck to Knox, Boston, Feb. 10, 1794. Knox MSS. XXXV:42; same to same, Feb. 16, 1794. Ibid, p. 49.]

"And now O Muse throw Candour's veil
O'er aged Sam, in dotage frail
And let past services atone
For recent deeds of folly done;
When late aboard the Gallic ship,
Well fraught with democratic flip,
He praying fell on servile knees,
That France alone might rule the seas,
While Sense and Reason took a nap,
And snor'd in Jacobinic cap.
His other acts, both grave and jolly
Behold! are in the book of Folly:
Yet should he with his fathers sleep,
We'd strive with all our might—to weep."

(88) "I am happy that Massachusetts has once more attained...[a] respectable character...a few...demagogues...have endeavoured to represent her citizens as friends to mobbery and every disorganizing measure and have been influential enough to create riotous proceedings in...[Boston]. The lameness of the Executive on those occasions have served to second the evil report which has spread against her reputation." Centinel, Feb. 13, 1796. Increase Sumner was nominated informally by the 16th of February. There is a curious statement in the Centinel, April 6, 1796, regarding the nomination. "This year, in consequence of some disorders in this town, and for other causes, a number of gentlemen from the country...proposed to...place Judge Sumner in the chair." On the 21st of January Gore writes to King: "It is more than probable that an effort will be made to displace Adams...[by] Sumner." King: King, II:55.

their opponents.⁸⁹ The two leading candidates were indisputably Increase Sumner and Samuel Adams, the present governor. Unwearied exertions were made by the federalists in behalf of their candidate.⁹⁰ A supposedly convincing argument addressed to the citizens of Massachusetts was that "in the life of man he is twice a child. . . . Thus. . . they ought not to invest the high office to a Governor in dotage."⁹¹ The reply of a republican to this "British" accusation was that if he is "feeble & debilitated as you falsely represent him, [he] has made even your master George the Third to tremble, and who still remains, like the worm that never dies, a scourge to the enemies of America."⁹² The friends of Adams constantly remind the people of his great patriotism, that he and Hancock were the only ones excepted from the proffered act of pardon. When, however, they sought to use Hancock's popularity to magnify their candidate by descanting on the warm friendships which existed between these two patriots, they trod on very insecure ground. There were too many

(89) Amory: Sullivan, II:54: "he not only discouraged his own nomination, but engaged actively in the canvass, defending Mr. Adams from the attacks."

(90) See "The Elector," which came out in four numbers in the Hampshire Gazette, March 2, 9, 16, 23, 1796. Also "Cassius" in the Mass. Spy, March 30, 1796: Fed. Orrery, April 4, 1796. Perhaps as sharp as anything is the remark of the Salem Gazette, March 29, 1796: "We have repeatedly wished a change, but the Satellites of Anarchy have prevented it, that their Patron, as Governor of Massachusetts, might give a tone to all the principles and practices of Jacobin mischief." A good deal was made of his alleged opposition to Washington during the Revolution. Centinel, April 2, 1796. There is an elaborate list of charges against the Governor in *Ibid.*, March 23, 26, 1796. They are much the same as in previous elections. A cordial invitation is extended to Adams to resign as Gov. Trumbull of Connecticut did "who in a handsome and pathetic address. . . took leave of public life." A further reason is that both branches of the legislature and the Council are opposed to him. This is quite true, so much so that he "had other Counsellors than those appointed for him by the Constitution," and it is affirmed with assurance that he did not read his speech—denouncing Jay's Treaty to his Council—as it was customary at least to do.

(91) *Ibid.*, March 5, 1796. Of like import is an earlier version of this "aged" accusation. "It is high time. . . to 'put off the OLD MAN,' and 'put on the new,' and I trust the former will be equally candid as John the Baptist was towards his successor, when he declared 'he must INCREASE, but I must decrease.'" *Ibid.*, Feb. 17, 1796. It was somewhat charitably suggested that it was "the Shaking Palsey for several years, [which] has weakened his [Adams'] mind to such a degree as has made him a dupe to the ambitious designs of a Party who wish to ruin the country. . . Jarvis, Austin, and Vinal. unprincipled ["villains"] . . . at the head of every faction. . . entirely rule his conduct." Hampshire Gazette, March 2, 1796.

(92) *Ind. Ch.*, March 7, 1796.

"who on Gala days [had] . . . been entertained by the generosity of [Hancock] . . . [and knew] how often he has expressed his disapprobation of this CYNICK, who refused his invitations and declared it *wicked* in a Republic to enjoy the good things of Providence. . . ."⁹³ So well known were the criticisms of Hancock by Adams, that the following squib had at least a strong veri-similitude of truth. "There are citizens who firmly believe that the greater part of the *matter* of the celebrated strictures on Gov. H. under the signature of 'Laco,' were furnished, either *orally* or in *writing*, by Gov. ADAMS."⁹⁴

The result of the election bore out the statement addressed to the "British desperadoes." "Go to," it exclaimed, "Ye may as well attempt to move Mount Atlas, as to remove from the breasts of true born Americans a love & esteem for. . . [Adams]."⁹⁵ The Governor received 15,195 out of a total vote of 26,493—his opponent having 10,184. The latter vote is a rather interesting proof of the growing strength of party allegiance, the federalist candidate having little to recommend him in comparison with the "Patriot of '75." Dividing the state as before into three sections, we find, that while in the east the increase of the republican vote was 148 over that of the federalists, in the west the former actually gained 392 votes, the latter 1,810 and turned a minority of 603 votes into a majority of 1,599 from the vote cast in 1794, and in the Maine section, the republican gain is but 243, that of the federalists 348. What with the legislature exhibiting throughout its session "enlightened Federalism," the future, as

(93) Centinel, March 5, 1796. It is further asserted that when Adams was President of the Senate he made "it appear that [Hancock]..was the mere pagent of the Whig Party, whose property and pleasurable talents they thought useful; but whom they with great difficulty kept steady to their cause." Ibid, April 2, 1796.

(94) Ibid, March 30, 1796.

(95) Ind. Ch., March 7, 1796. See p. 179, n. 24.

well it might, looked roseate to the Massachusetts federalists, in the face of Sumner's defeat.

CHAPTER X.

THE CLERGY AND THE DEMOCRATS.

Despite the re-election of Samuel Adams in the spring of 1796, the federalist vote was a most cheering omen of coming victory.¹ The well nigh unanimous response of the Massachusetts towns to the attempt of the House of Representatives to nullify Jay's Treaty was a splendid augury of future federalism in state matters.² No sooner had the legislature, elected that spring, assembled than it gave

(1) The federalist nominees for the Boston Seat received 1,374, 1,317, 1,306 and 1,224, while the republican candidates had 798, 768, 765 and 751. There were three union candidates. *Mass. Mercury*, May 11, 14, 1796. Samuel Adams offered himself as presidential elector that fall, but was beaten. The Boston votes show again how closely party lines were drawn and how little the ratio had changed from the spring. On the republican ticket were Adams for elector (975 votes) Bowdoin [son of James Bowdoin, who had become a republican to the intense disgust of "his father's friends"] for congressman (982 votes); while Dawes for elector and Otis for congressman on the federalist ticket received 1420 and 1408 respectively. *Centinel*, Nov. 7, 9, 12, 1796. A great outcry over fraud and intimidation is raised by the defeated republicans. *Ind. Ch.*, Nov. 10, 1796. The reply is that Adams received 1570 votes last April, but only 975 this, and that if this election contained illegal votes "what must the first have been." *Centinel*, Nov. 12, 1796. The scandal was so notorious (see *ibid.*, Jan. 16, 1797) that Samuel Adams takes up the matter in his address to the General Court on January 27, 1797. *Ibid.*, Jan. 28, 1797.

(2) In consequence of a circular letter the towns adopted memorials requesting the House of Representatives to carry out Jay's Treaty. During the month of April and into May the votes of the towns were being forwarded to Washington. All the important coast towns took emphatic action. *Centinel*, April 23, 27, 1796. Boston's town meeting was favorable by a great vote—estimated to be twenty-three or twenty-four hundred to one hundred. *Ibid.*, April 27. The same paper says there is a "general spirit to rise en masse, and petition Congress.. the Ministers of the Gospel of PEACE will feel themselves called upon..to aid.." The appeal did not go unheeded as the anger of the republicans testifies. Said one: "The self-created Circulating Letter Committee, with Deacons at the head, & some of the Clergy in the middle will never urge the real patriots of America to sacrifice France to assist England." *Ind. Ch.*, April 30, 1796. The clergy did not hesitate to read the circular letter from the pulpit, and as the parish and the town coincided often an impromptu meeting was held then and there—this being a work of necessity. *Centinel*, May 4, 1796. The circular letter was sent out "to every town and plantation in the state" by April 30th. See the *Centinel* of that date. In Hampshire County the address of Judge Dana to the grand jury was used as a basis for a circular letter which was sent to all the towns in that county. *Ibid.*, May 4, 1796. It was reported: "Fifty-six out of sixty towns will be unanimously in favor;" and every town in Worcester county there is "reason to think..will be" unanimous likewise. *Ibid.*, May 7, 1796. The *Independent Chronicle* (May 9, 1796) after boldly reciting the names of fourteen towns "where said Memorial was introduced..and where it either received their marked disapprobation, or was taken no notice of [and] In some towns it was even burnt [this later statement being denied in the *Centinel*, May 11], in others it was tore up.." takes refuge behind the safe remark "And many other..

unmistakable evidence of its federalistic bias by changing the state printing from the Independent Chronicle to journals whose party affiliations were in strict accord with the majority.³

The fall elections, especially in the western portions, proved that the federalist majority in the spring did not come from a temporary condition. The Hon. W. S. Lyman, who had heretofore represented the Hampshire district—misrepresented it in the eyes of the federalists—and who had supported the “faction of Maddison” was in disgrace for that reason and failed of re-election.⁴ In the Berkshire district, two federalists struggled for the seat in Congress, left vacant by the resignation of Theodore Sedgwick, just elected to the Senate of the United States.⁵

towns.” This poor showing included scattering villages of Middlesex, Bristol, Plymouth and the District of Maine. For a continuous throng of town actions see the Centinel, May 4, 7, 11, 14, 1796. The Hampshire Gazette (May 11, 1796) says as to Berkshire County: “Most of the towns..have had meetings and voted to petition Congress to carry..the treaty into effect.” A memorial from the town of Boston was signed by 1300, Salem attached 650 to her petition. Centinel, April 27, 1796. J. Morse to O. Wolcott, Charlestown, May 4, 1796. Wolcott MSS. Conn. Hist. Soc.: “An attempt was lately made in Boston..to obtain signers to a Counter Petition to Congress, a la modo Phila. New York etc—About 20

his
written names were obtained, & then they came to X ..[so] they gave up the
mark

plot—”

(3) Ind. Ch., June 6, 1796. See account of the votes in the legislature in the Hampshire Gazette, June 8, 1796. So confident of the federalistic sentiments of the legislature was Caleb Strong (United States Senator at this time) that he writes to W. Phillips: “I have perfect Confidence in the present General Assembly so far as I have heard of the Elections that my Successor will be of that Description..” Phila., June 1, 1796. Strong MSS. Forbes Library, Northampton, Mass. See also G. Cabot to King, Brookline, July 24, 1796. King: King, II:66-7.

(4) F. Ames to O. Wolcott, Dedham, Sept. 2, 1796. Gibbs: Memoirs, I:385; Hampshire Gazette, Nov. 9, 16, 1796. The charge was made in 1794, but failed to defeat him. Fed. Spy, May 27, 1794.

(5) The contestants were T. J. Skinner of Williamstown and Ephraim Williams of Stockbridge. The former was a democrat masquerading as a federalist. The accusation against Skinner that he was opposed to the Treaty caused a great ferment in his native town and affidavits from many citizens including the President of Williams certified to his simon pure federalistic sentiments. Hampshire Gazette, Aug. 31, 1796. The first trial resulted in a plurality for Williams by about 70 votes—the law demanding a majority. On the second trial Skinner's friends made the greater exertions. They accused Williams of “principles so extremely grateful to the old royalists” and of “connections with a Senator” [Sedgwick] and with “the professors of the law..” Hampshire Gazette, Oct. 2, 1796. These were sufficient to turn the scale and elect Skinner. But as the Centinel (for Sept. 7, 1796) said: “It is no ill compliment on the federalism of the Western district, that..[there] are as many as [fifty]..certificates and depositions on oath..[attesting]..to the federalism of Gen. Skinner.” Sedgwick to O.

The credit for the overturn in the state was clearly recognized as early as the beginning of this year, 1796, in as much as the Centinel announces that to "the clergy of Massachusetts...in a great measure ...it is owing...that the substantial yeomanry of Massachusetts and New Hampshire have on every late occasion exhibited the most honorable traits of unadulterated Federalism."⁶ And the brother of Fisher Ames, an unmitigated democrat, notes with acerbity in his diary: "Priests made Politicians by Boston Tors."⁷ Credit is likewise given to the clergy by the republicans who cease not to assail them for their political activity. A warning, which falls upon deaf ears, is sounded amid a diatribe against the clergy as follows: "It is time for the people to think for themselves, and no longer be duped by any order of men whatever."⁸

Much asperity and criticism is aroused by "a most high handed...circular letter...directed to the respective Clergymen in the Commonwealth.... This ...Committee was a *self created society*... to influence the people through the medium of the clergy..."⁹ A profane individual clothes his attacks in scriptural language. The attempt at a parable was "Some of the tribes of Levi are striving to carry the People of Israel to the other side of the

Wolcott, Stockbridge, June 26, 1796. Gibbs: *Memoirs*, I:363: "I much fear that Mr. Skinner will prevail..In politics he is exactly the counterpart of..Varnum [a Republican Congressman from Middlesex County], and yet he has had the address to make many good people believe him to be highly federal."

(6) Feb. 13, 1796. At a formal dinner given to John Adams by the citizens of Boston all "Business stood still for the day to see Festivity at its enjoyment"—one of the toasts was "The Reverend Clergy. May they continue to oppose an insurmountable barrier, against heretical opinions in Church and State." *Mass. Spy*, Aug. 23, 1797. The comment by the *Independent Chronicle* (Aug. 21, 1797) on the toasts was: we are "led to pity the syncophancy of men in holy orders, and in their professional habiliments courting the smiles of a nominal great man," ending with the malicious comment: "The President attended THE THEATRE in the evening, this possibly was pleasing to the Rev. Clergy, who waited on him during the day in their sacerdotal; as it formed an 'alliance offensive and defensive' between the Stage and the Pulpit." This was all in an editorial, which was not common then.

(7) Dedham Hist. Reg. 7:78. For other characteristic comments see *ibid.*, pp. 116-7.

(8) See Appendix K.

(9) *Ind. Ch.*, April 6, 1797.

waters of the red sea...and are trying to make them serve again under the yoke of Pharoah.'"¹⁰ This is pleasantry. Other attacks are bitter as can be imagined.¹¹ The truth of the disagreeable situation—for the democrats—is set forth, although in garbled fashion, in a communication of November 27th in the *Independent Chronicle*: "Church and state are said to be in danger from the machinations of our violent Democrats. This is a second edition of the old watchword, 'Church and King.' The royal faction [*i. e.*, the federalists], unable to support their sinking cause by its own merits, have ingeniously attempted to prevent its downfall by uniting its fate with that of the church."

Were the clergy silent, meek, and turning the other cheek to all these buffetings? On the contrary, they belonged to a church which was indeed a church militant, which was accustomed rather to carry the attack into the enemy's country. On the 26th day of May, the Rev. Jeremy Belknap preached a sermon before the annual convention of the clergy in Massachusetts. The significance of this discourse is twofold. The larger part is taken up with the "afflictions of the gospel" which the clergy are called upon to endure. Among the various woes incident to their profession are the attacks upon the clergy "for

(10) *Ibid.*, May 25, 1797. "Pharoah" being the King of England.

(11) And the replies are in kind. "In this region," comments a Vermonter, "common sense seems puzzled to account for the sentiments [of the Jacobins]...who absolutely prefer French politics...[and] French atheism...We suppose a Jacobin to be a...salt water wild indian...which at times vomits forth fire and brimstone at good Gen. Washington...and the whole body of New England Clergy." *Centinel*, June 14, 1797. "The Jacobins...omitted no opportunity to ridicule Christianity and to harrass, vilify and slander... the Clergy..." *Ibid.*, Sept. 16, 1797. Another in a defence of the clergy gave an account of the French treatment of ministers and religion. *Ibid.*, April 26, 1797. Still another defender remarks: "It is not to be wondered at, if the Tom Paines, and the Ethan Allens of the present day, having pierced the sides of the Redeemer, should point their spears against the ministers." *Mass. Spy*, Nov. 15, 1797. See also *ibid.*, Nov. 8, 1797. The "importance [of the clergy] has been most sensibly felt by their country in several critical periods, particularly in the American revolution, at the adoption of the state and federal constitution, and at a late alarming crisis [Jay's Treaty and the opposition later in the House of Representatives]." *Ibid.*, April 19, 1797.

political preaching.’”¹² And on this point the preacher dwells for nearly four pages of the printed sermon, while the others receive a much less extended treatment, being disposed of in the space of two pages or less. Nor is this all that is significant. In his defense of their stand he cites the example of the ancient prophets, who hesitated not to rebuke even the princes of Israel, of Christ and the “*disorganizing* Pharisees,” Apostle Paul, and finally St. Peter, who “pointedly denounce[d] the judgment of God against those who despise government, and speak evil of dignities, stigmatizing them with the epithets of presumptuous and self-willed; characterizing them as political hypocrites, who, whilst they promise liberty, are themselves servants of corruption; comparing them to Balaam, who loved the wages of unrighteousness; and applying to them that true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.”¹³ This is an excellent example of what those men of God were fond of describing as “pungent preaching,” a course which was as likely to

(12) Much the same language is held by David Tappan the next year at the convention of the Congregational clergy: “The same principles [i. e. attachment to the State “not only by the same ties of affection and interest with their fellow-citizens, but by the sacred and endearing bonds of pastoral duty and love, and by their peculiar concern for the security and flourishing care of the Church, which has an important connection with civil liberty and order”]. have more recently called forth the same energies in behalf of our threatened national dignity, authority, and peace. In these efforts, the eye of candor beholds a refutation of those infidels and demagogues who hold up gospel ministers as forming a dangerous aristocracy [etc.]” p. 26. The following year—1798—on the same occasion David Osgood is very explicit regarding “The cause in which we are engaged [which] is evilly spoken against. numbers have been prejudiced against religion. disposed to abandon their religion, and turn their backs on its teachers. They despise our office, and set at naught all our counsel. On every side we hear their defaming, and the hard speeches that are uttered against us.” p. 11. See likewise Buckminster, Joseph: A Sermon preached at Concord before the Ecclesiastical Convention of New Hampshire, June 5, 1799; Harris, William: A Sermon delivered in Boston, before the annual convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Massachusetts. 28th of May, 1799. Esp. pp. 6-10, 12-13, 16-17. At the convention of the clergy of Massachusetts in Boston, May 30th, 1799, the Rev. Eli Forbes deemed it best to preach on the “Inoffensive Ministry,” which was somewhat of a misnomer for he too expatiates [on p. 27] upon the “flood of infidelity and practical atheism [which] threatens to corrupt and to deluge our land; we must unite to stem the tide of disorganizing and demoralizing principles.”

(13) pp. 16-17.

arouse hard feelings and revilings, as to prick the conscience. The angry retorts of those "who if [they]...will...wear such a character...must blame themselves for the reproach which is necessarily attached" left the matter entirely clear as to which party they belonged.¹⁴

Lest this example be considered unique, let the Rev. Henry Cuming's opinion of the democrats be quoted. In his sermon of December 15, 1796, he mildly remarks: "It has been the infelicity of America...to have a warm and active party...restless [fellows]...[who] have taken unwearied pains to precipitate us into a war with Great Britain...[however our] strict neutrality [can not] be broken by the intrigues of foreign ministers, or by the insidious sophistry and alarming declamations of their venal sycophants...This hidden way of traducing and bespattering the character of the illustrious Washington, bears great resemblance to the Indian way of bush-fighting, when invisible...concealed...like timid poltroons....[they] discharge their lead undiscovered; which...is commonly considered...as sneaking and dastardly, and an evident mark of cowardice." He closes with a warning, "let us be particularly on our guard against...those uneasy discontented self-applauders, who...are perpetually *speaking* evil of dignities..."¹⁵ This is strong meat, no whit less than Cobbett's famous pamphlet whose title indicates its contents "A Bone to Gnaw for the Democrats." With clear intention that his allusion be not mistaken, the Rev. Alvan Hyde thundered how "Awful was the display of divine wrath, when Korah, Dathan and Abiram stirred up a mutiny in Israel,¹⁶ and presumed boldly to speak

(14) *Ibid.* p. 16.

(15) p. 33.

(16) This simile is a very favorite one with the clergy even in 1795. Dr. Tappan (Cambridge, Feb. 19th, 1795) draws a striking parallel between ancient

against the administration of Moses'' and concludes with a moving and pathetic peroration "our amazing ingratitude bursts forth to light:—our amazing ingratitude, not only to...[God], but, to...Washington... May the Lord forgive the ingratitude of this people...[to] Washington."¹⁷ Such extracts as these show that the objections of the democrats to political preaching were well founded.¹⁸

But the sermons delivered up to this time—rabid and venomous as their victims considered them—by no means mark the high tide of clerical interest and interference in political affairs. With the widely trumpeted discovery of an alleged plot against religion,¹⁹ coupled with the insults and threats from the French Directory—the X. Y. Z. letters—and injuries by French depredations, the clergy reach a height of animosity and unbridled fulminations in their sermons, hitherto unequalled.²⁰

Israel and the Americans, whose unthankful and rebellious murmurings, etc. The Rev. Jonathan Strong (on November 19, 1795, at Randolph) reprovingly said: "The more Moses and Aaron, the servants of the Lord, laboured to promote their happiness, the more they murmured...And is not this as true respecting the First Magistrate of our nation, (waving the mention of many other public characters)?" p. 35. See e. g. Frisbie, L., Ipswich, Feb. 19, 1795, p. 23; Strong, N., Hartford, (Conn.) Nov. 16, 1797, p. 11; Gillett, E., Hallowell, [Me.] April 25, 1799. pp. 1-2 et seq.

(17) Lee, Dec. 15, 1796, pp. 22-3.

(18) The straits to which a minister was reduced in a community where the French feeling ran high is well illustrated in the preface to the sermon of Jonathan Freeman delivered at New Windsor and Bethlehem (Vt.) August 30, 1798: "there being many in favor of France...I concluded not to observe publicly the day appointed for a fast by the General Assembly [of the Presbyterian Church]... between the fear of giving offence if I preached as duty and conscience determined, and the fear of incurring the displeasure of heaven if I should not preach...I was balancing, until a few days before...the fast...The discourse as I expected raised...[a] ferment—misrepresentation succeeded." pp. III to IV. To back up his distasteful charges he gives a bibliography of the authorities used on page V.

(19) See Appendix L.

(20) It is not to be supposed that the republicans were silenced. A few references out of many that might be cited will suffice. On July 9, 1798, an "open enemy" in the Independent Chronicle uses the phrases: "How foul is the tongue of Priests exciting to War...a bloody Priest" and asserts that the clergy "misinterpret the writings of good men...misquote and misrepresent...scripture... with the most bare-faced impudence...and blasphemous impunity." A letter of that federalistic divine the Rev. Jedediah Morse to O. Wolcott bears out the first part of the above accusation: "We are waiting with almost impatience to have War declared agt. France that we may distinguish more decidedly between friends and foes among ourselves. I believe there is energy enough in government to silence & if necessary to exterminate its obstinate & dangerous enemies." Charlestown, July 13, 1798. Wolcott MSS. Conn. Hist. Soc. For other attacks see the Ind. Ch., Jan. 4, 8, 11, Feb. 5, 22, March 26, April 2, 5, 9, 12, 16, 30.

On the 9th of May, 1798, David Osgood, the "civ-
 deyant Bishop of Medford," preached a scorching
 sermon on "Some facts evincive of the atheistical,
 anarchical, and, in other respects, immoral prin-
 ciples of the French Republicans," in the course of
 which he paid his respects to the "American Repub-
 licans," and their newspapers, carefully named,
 which "are so many decoys to draw us within the
 reach of her fraternal embrace. If you would not be
 ravished by the monster, drive her panders from
 among you. The editors, patrons, and abettors of
 those vehicles of slander...those wet-nurses of
 a French faction in the bowels of our country, have
 no longer any cloak for their guilt—[they] who still
 . . . plead . . . the cause of France . . . ought to be
 considered and treated as enemies to their coun-
 try. . . . Brethren, mark them . . . and let them
 wear the stigma of reproach due to the perfidious be-
 trayers of their country, . . . whose abilities [are]
 exerted in abusing and slandering the . . . rulers. . . .
 Of all traitors, they are the most aggravatedly
 criminal; of all villains, they are the most infamous
 and detestable."²¹

This language was held consistently by the en-
 raged and alarmed clergy, who were convinced that
 "Our *political* and *religious* interests had not [in the
 American Revolution] that close and indissoluble
 connection then, which they have now. . . . Shall
 those, then, who are *set for the defense of the Gospel*,
 and who have solemnly sworn to vindicate it, basely
 desert their posts? Or . . . look silently on, and . . .
 give no warning of danger? . . . My brethren, rest
 assured that . . . [your pastor's] efforts, however feeble
 shall not be wanting to the cause of his threatened

[this last by "Brattle Street" (E. E. Sullivan, see Amory: Sullivan II:57. B. Austin and S. Adams are also implicated in these various attacks. See *ibid.* pp. 57-8.) an assault upon Prof. Tappan.] May 3, 28, (etc.), 1798.

(21) pp. 22-3.

and suffering country.’’²² The most famous sermon discharged in these turbulent days was by President Timothy Dwight, of Yale. It was preached on the 4th of July, 1798, and was widely quoted by admiring divines. An extract will indicate sufficiently that truculent preacher’s sentiments: “For what end shall we be connected with [the French] . . . that our churches may become temples of reason, our Sabbath a decade, and our psalms of praise Mar-seillais hymns? Is it that we may change our holy worship into a dance of *Jacobin* phrenzy, and that we may behold a strumphet personating a Goddess on the alters of JEHOVAH? Is it that we may see the Bible cast into a bonfire, the vessels of the sacramental supper borne by an ass . . . and our children chanting mockeries against God . . . ? Is it that we may see our wives and daughters . . . dishonored . . . polluted . . . outcasts . . . ? Is it that we may see, in our public papers, a solemn comparison drawn by an American Mother club between . . . Christ and a new Marat; and the fiend of malice exalted above the . . . Redeemer . . . ? Shall our sons become the disciples of Voltaire and the dragons of Marat; or our daughters the concubines of the Illuminati?’’²³

So thoroughly were the clergy convinced that “This infidelity [from France] (served up in pamphlet and pocket volumes for the common people, in histories and encyclopedias for the learned [and] . . . kindly circulated among the people . . . [who are told] that they have been hoodwinked and priest-ridden,)”²⁴ has caused multitudes . . . [to] . . . turn downright deists, . . . vast numbers . . . to embrace principles . . . clearly repugnant both to Scripture

(22) Dana, D., Newburyport, April 25, 1799. p. 54.

(23) pp. 20-1.

(24) Kirkland, J. T., Boston, May 9, 1798. pp. 12-14.

(and reason," and that "every year evidently increases the number of Sabbath-breakers,"²⁵ that they feel stirred to some official action) Solemnly, in convention assembled, an address was drawn up and signed unanimously by the clergy who "duly lament those atheistical, licentious and disorganizing principles, which have been avowed and zealously propagated by the philosophers and politicians of France. . . This intimate connection between our civil and Christian blessings, is alone sufficient to justify the decided part which the clergy of America have uniformly taken in supporting the constituted authorities and political interests of their country. While we forgive the censure which our order has received from some persons on this account, we will still, by our prayers and examples, by our public and private discourses, continue the same tenor of conduct

(25) *Ibid.*, pp. 12-13.

Even Dr. Priestly—a very liberally minded philosopher who was disposed to interpret the developments in France, even to the prevailing fashion of atheism, in the most optimistic way—now regards the present age as alarming in America. In an address to a congregation in Philadelphia he says: "And surely never was infidelity, joined with profligacy, both as to cause and effect so prevalent as it is at this day. Let us do what we can to stem the overwhelming torrent." This is strikingly different from the hopes cherished in his answer to Paine's *Age of Reason*, being *A Continuation of the Letters to the Philosophers and Politicians of France on the Subject of Religion*; and of the *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever*, in Answer to Mr. Paine's *Age of Reason* in which he comments that "The turn that infidelity has lately taken in France is not a little remarkable; but it promises well for the cause of religion. We must not, however, be surprised if infidelity should continue to prevail to a much greater extent than it has done yet." All this is in the *Salem Gazette*, Jan. 13th, 1795. This complacent view which was shared by others in 1795 was utterly changed in less than two years. *Salem Gazette*, April 28, 1797. A paragraph in the *Political Gazette*, (Aug. 24, 1797, from the *Mass. Mercury*) exhibits "The situation in our country [as] . . . serious and alarming, both in a moral and political view. The rapid progress of corruption and vice . . . is a subject of common remark among our own citizens, as well as among foreigners. . ." See also the *Hampshire Gazette*—June 27, 1798—for a doleful account of the spread of French atheism here. The Bench began to take judicial notice of the spread of atheism through the machinations of the French. See the charges of Chief Justice Elsworth to the Grand Jury of the United States (*Western Star*, April 17, 1797), Judge Rush to the Grand Juries of Bucks, Luzerne and Northumberland Counties (Pa.) (*Impartial Herald*, Oct. 12, 1798); Judge Cushing to the Federal Grand Jury for the District of Virginia—November 23, 1798 (*Newburyport Herald*, June 8, 1799). Likewise orations were spouted on the same subject. Fiske, O., Worcester, July 4, 1797. Worcester, 1797, pp. 7-10; Allen, B., *An Oration in defense of Divine Revelation. delivered. . . at the Commencement of Rhode Island College*, September 6, A. D. 1797. Providence, R. I., 1797; Whitman, K., *Bridgewater*, Oct. 4, 1798. Boston, 1798; Parish, E., *Byfield*, July 4, 1799. Newburyport, n. d. *The Centinel*—July 20, 1799—remarks: "The best performance. . . was the Oration on Atheism, by the Rev. Mr. Woods. . ."

which has incurred this malevolent or misguided abuse.'²⁶

Nor were clerical tumults and shoutings over the dangers to the country from the French abated one jot or tittle the next year, since the President gave official confirmation to the alarmist contentions of the clergy. In his proclamation setting aside April 25th for a National Fast Day because of the supposed imminence of war with France he affirmed (and such sentiments must have been read with more than a tinge of satisfaction, amidst all the heavy solemnity of the occasion, in most New England pulpits): "The most precious interests of the people of the United States are still held in jeopardy by the hostile designs and insidious arts of a foreign nation, as well as by the dissemination among them of those principles subversive of all religious, moral and social obligations that have produced incalculable mischief and misery in other countries."²⁷ Fortified by such unimpeachable authority the clergy renewed their lamentations, reiterated their warnings of danger and redoubled those politico-spiritual thunders²⁸ which were, however, by constant repetition losing somewhat their convincing effectiveness.

(26) Quoted in the Hampshire Gazette, June 27th, 1798. The address was drawn up on May 31st. It was sent to the President who made a suitable reply. Ind. Ch., June 23, 1798. It naturally aroused the prejudices of those who felt themselves and their political attachments reflected upon. See two attacks in *ibid.*, June 23, 1798.

(27) Richardson: Messages..of the Presidents. I:285.

(28) See Appendix J.

CHAPTER XI.

THE TRIUMPH OF THE FEDERALIST PARTY, 1796 TO 1800.

The political revolution in Massachusetts, which had been accomplished by 1796, was practically consummated by the announcement of Samuel Adams in a message to the General Court that he was determined to retire from politics that spring. The federalists heartily acquiesced in the governor's determination, their only regret being that his resolution had not been taken at least a year earlier, and again confidently nominated Increase Sumner.² Their hopes were the greater since their opponents were rent into two factions by a difference of opinion regarding candidates. The rank and file, especially in Maine, desired James Sullivan, who was the present attorney-general and the astute councillor of Hancock and Adams. But he was not acceptable to the Boston leaders, who were dominated by Benjamin Austin, still implacable to lawyers,³ and it may be harboring other grudges—and so the Boston caucus was induced to nominate James Gill, the present lieutenant-governor.⁴ Now, while the vote of the Boston caucus generally directed the action of

(1) The governor announced his decision in his message to the legislature on January 27th. Centinel, Jan. 28, 1797. He offered his age as the reason. This in itself was sufficient to induce him to refuse to be a candidate, but he doubtless feared that he would not be successful. The fact that the legislature as well as his council was so thoroughly in opposition to his republican sentiments and his defeat as candidate for presidential Elector a little more than a month before probably had influence in his decision.

(2) Centinel, Feb. 13, 17, 20, 1797. There were numerous nominations such as Gen. Knox, Gill and Daniel Coney (of Maine) Gill and Samuel Phillips, Sullivan and Gill, and Sullivan and Heath.

(3) Greenfield Gazette, March 23, 1797. "Honestus" feels still called upon to express his attitude of hostility to the lawyers. E. g. in the Centinel—Feb. 26, 1794—they are denounced as "Harpies."

(4) Benjamin Austin, "old Honestus," was the moving spirit in splitting the party vote in this manner. Amory: Sullivan, II:55. For the "lasting impressions" made upon the yeomanry of this commonwealth "by the writings of 'Honestus'" see Ind. Ch., March 30, 1797. See also his Constitutional Republicanism in opposition to Fallacious Federalism. Boston, 1803.

the state party, in this case the rural democrats in all parts of the state would have none of the latter, but generally supported the people's candidate, James Sullivan.⁵

With this divided opposition, the federalists swept the state, losing only Middlesex—the most consistent republican stronghold (which only once,—in 1798,—gave a federalist majority), and York and Washington counties in Maine.⁶

The events of the next year, 1798, all contributed to reduce the republican vote to a mere scattering handful.⁷ So popular was the governor and so unpopular had France made herself and her cause in this country by her intolerable actions and attitude⁸ that the democrats made no effort to nominate a candidate to oppose Increase Sumner.⁹ They concentrated their efforts on staving off the war which the federalists were clamoring for, to exciting the towns to petition Congress against arming American merchant vessels, and to deprecating the various steps taken towards hostilities with France.¹⁰ And

(5) Moses Gill did not receive much support for governor outside of Suffolk (Boston), Middlesex, Cumberland (Me.) and Lincoln (Me.) counties. The vote being in the first 880 for Gill, 1071 for Sumner and 27 for Sullivan; in the second 638, 858, 1489 respectively, third 430, 740, 94, fourth, 341, 947, 623. The total vote in the Maine district being 1016, 2602, 1403 respectively. The same faction which nominated Gill in Boston for governor ran James Bowdoin (the younger) for lieutenant-governor, as is shown by the votes in Boston, 867 and 788 respectively, while Sumner and Gill received 1054 and 1062 respectively. Bowdoin received but 513 votes from the rest of the state and Gill, who had the support of everybody else, obtained 17,791 as lieutenant-governor. The total vote for governor was Sumner, 14,540; Sullivan, 7,125; Gill, 3,573.

(6) Washington was the smallest county as to population in Maine—generally indeed giving a federalist majority—this year being one of its four democratic years. The vote was 124 (Sullivan)—113 (Sumner).

(7) In western Massachusetts the vote stood 6,134 to 304 in favor of Increase Sumner. Out of 135 towns making returns there were 114 unanimously federalist. In 1799 the vote was almost as overwhelming—out of 136 towns, 111 were likewise unanimous. Even in 1800 there were still thirty without a democratic voter. In Maine the majority in 1798 was quite as large, being 4,251 to 236, while in eastern Massachusetts the vote was 7,113 to 1,627.

(8) See Appendix M.

(9) In the Independent Chronicle of April 2nd, 1798, there is a reference to the fact that James Sullivan would be voted for by the republicans, but it is probable that no caucus had been held.

(10) Previously to the publication of the X. Y. Z. documents there were a few towns which had voted against the arming: Milton, Centinel, March 24, 1798; Roxbury, Ind. Ch., March 26, 1798; Cambridge, Bridgewater and Abington adopted resolutions and drew up petitions to Congress praying them to avert

in this they achieved a certain measure of success, until the publication of the so-called X. Y. Z. letters, which put a sudden damper on their most energetic activities.

While the campaign for governor in the spring of 1799 is remarkably free from contention and the republicans refrain from attacking Sumner, who appears respected by all factions (indeed, a writer in the *Centinel*, March 20th, supposes it to be a joke that General Heath is being supported in opposition), yet the events which were taking place outside the state had a powerful influence over the people's political predilections. Probably nothing had a more decisive effect than the heavy "war taxes" which were being collected. Thus, despite the fact that there was no formal caucus to nominate the democratic candidate, a common impression spread that General Heath was to be voted for by all lovers of peace and those economically inclined.¹¹

Early in January, Jefferson wrote to Madison: "The Republican spirit is supposed to be gaining ground in Massachusetts," and the cause was "The tax gatherer [who] has already excited discontent."¹² His political sagacity in this respect was

war with France. *Centinel*, April 11, 17, 1798. By the *Independent Chronicle*—April 16—it is announced that the towns of Lexington, Dorchester and Falmouth on April 20th have taken similar action. Action took action finally. *Ibid.*, May 20, 1798. On the other hand with the publication of the X. Y. Z. documents, public indignation flared up in New England as elsewhere and the addresses to the President began to pour in. 1,500 names were achieved in a single day—the 23rd of April—in Boston. *Centinel*, April 25, 1798. Still the *Independent Chronicle* had the audacity to publish an editorial on April 12th, beginning "The conduct of France needs no apology."

(11) Gen. Heath seems to have been nominated by personal friends. See the *Ind. Ch.*, Feb. 25, March 14, 21, 28, April 1, 1799. Even the republicans do not seem to have realized the degree of opposition prevalent since the legislature had overwhelmingly shown their disapproval of the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions by a vote in the House of 116 to 29, and in the Senate a solitary vote was recorded in favor. This was cast by Bacon of Berkshire County. *Centinel*, Feb. 12, 1799. The federalists appealed to his constituents to defeat his re-election. *Ibid.*, Feb. 27, 1799. (See a eulogy of him in the *Ind. Ch.*, Feb. 25, 1799.) His defeat was chronicled with great pleasure in the *Centinel*, May 1, 1799. In *ibid.*, April 6, it was rudely announced that owing to the backwardness of the season "Green Peas and Bacon will be scarce the last Wednesday in May next." [i. e. when the legislature convenes.]

(12) Jan. 3, 1799. *Writings*, X:67.

amply proven by the subsequent elections. As an alarmed federalist wrote in the *Centinel*, April 17th, 1799, after the returns had come in for governor: "They [the Jacobins] know the weak side of the New-England farmers and Federalists, to be a love of money and of course a dread of expense. They have, therefore, seized with art and avidity this string which leads directly to the heart:—abandoning France . . . and almost ceasing to calumniate the best patriots, they [harp] . . . on the expenses of naval arrangements . . . standing army . . . fortifications, the eight per cent. Loan, and the Land Tax. This scheme, the most politic and the most dangerous which they could have adopted, has not been without its effect. It has created a division already. . . . " Especially were efforts made by the republicans to capture the legislature, although they had lost the governorship. The directing spirit was a "select caucus of the members of the General Court, which met a few evenings before the Court rose;—and how well these Jeffersonian puppets have acted their parts the returns . . . will . . . shew."¹³

Although the federalists were victorious again the next year, 1800, yet the split in the national party was reflected in the workings of the party in Massachusetts. And, indeed, the bitterness might be expected to be accentuated, seeing that several of the leading characters in that tragedy came from the New England section. The quarrel of the Essex Junto and John Adams lost nothing of its intensity after the so-called Party Revolution of 1800.

The death of Increase Sumner, before he took the oath of office in this year, 1799, was a severe blow to his party. It was likewise a great loss to the state,

(13) In regard to this effort the *Centinel*—June 1st, 1799—announces that "after all the cunning tricks, and industrious efforts the disorganizing faction..." have but 45 in the House and Senate.

for he had indeed "united all hearts," and his freedom from political bias made of him a refreshing and admirable contrast to the bitter actions and animosities of the politicians of that period.¹⁴

While Gill, who had been acting governor for this year's administration, 1799 to 1800, was not popular enough to be considered by either party to lead the ticket, all seemed to consider him as the best fitted and most available for the lieutenant-governorship.¹⁵ Still he is mentioned among the six who are talked of by the people for governor that spring, the other five being Heath, Strong, Gerry, Dana and Ames.¹⁶

The federalists took the first step in nominating Caleb Strong, of Northampton, recently United State senator, for governor.¹⁷ The democrats, in their turn, settled upon Eldridge Gerry,¹⁸ and their choice was certainly a shrewd one, for the latter, although criticised by the extreme federalists for his actions as one of the envoys to France, yet since

(14) See Abbot, A., A Sermon delivered at Haverhill, Nov. 28, 1798. p. 25.

(15) He is denounced as the candidate of some rich men who desire a rich governor. Ind. Ch., March 20, 1800. In *ibid*—April 3d—a correspondent accuses the federalists of maliciously pushing Gill in order to divide the opposition.

(16) Ind. Ch., Feb. 20, 1800. The reason why James Sullivan is not mentioned—and this holds good for the previous year—is that as attorney-general of the state it had been his unwelcome duty to prosecute one of the editors of the Independent Chronicle for a libel on the legislature in regard to the Virginia Resolutions. Centinel, March 30, 1799. The prosecution was only too successful and unhappy politician, although he published an article in the paper attacking the whole action of the authorities [Amory: Sullivan, II:66], had made himself too unpopular for the time being to be available politically. He had made many political enemies with his contentious and biting pen. See e. g. the Centinel, Nov. 25, 1789; April 13, 1791; esp. Mass. Gazette, March 14, 1788:

"Medusa's snakes have crawl'd from S[ullivan]'s pen
Their poison hiss'd, and backward crawl'd again,
To some dark, blasted, villainous retreat,
Where malice rankles and the furies meet:

To all conspiracies his talent lends
Against his country or his country's friends,
But truth turns pale and virtue in a frown
Speaks him the scorn and nuisance of the Town."

(17) The federalist candidate was nominated by a legislative caucus of a majority—it is asserted—of both houses, with the aid of other gentlemen. This method of procedure is the subject of violent censures by the democrats. See the Ind. Ch., Feb. 3, 10, 13, 17, 24, 27, 1800.

(18) *Ibid*, Feb. 13, 17, 24, 27, 1800.

he had been chosen by Adams, and had also, as Elector, voted for him, such qualifications gave him abundant standing in the eyes of moderate federalists.¹⁹

The campaign began early in February, and was conducted with vigor, even acrimoniously. Gerry was held up as an inflexible patriot since '75, and as "no friend of a mixed Monarchy, or to a Standing army"²⁰ and as a co-patriot with Hancock;²¹ while the federalists harped upon his opposition to the adoption of the Federal Constitution by Massachusetts.²² The fact that Strong was a lawyer was used industriously against him, while the question as to his active patriotism during the Revolution was raised.²³ However, his well-known connection with Joseph Hawley, of Northampton, the great friend of Samuel Adams, and the early and only important patriotic leader of the western part of the state, settled easily that point.

The result of the election²⁴ is well set forth and summed up in a letter of Stephen Higginson to Timothy Pickering: "Gerry has been run beyond all expectation, he follows Strong very close, and at times has led him; . . . much has been done by holding up Gerry as the friend of Adams and of peace, as well as of the people and the rights of man. The

(19) This is admitted by the Centinel, April 9th, 1800.

(20) Ind. Ch., Feb. 24, 1800.

(21) Ibid, March 10, 1800.

(22) Centinel, April 5, 1800. The federalists are much exercised on account of the fact that the democrats have assumed the name of Federal Republicans.

(23) Ind. Ch., March 20, 1800.

(24) In dividing the state into the three sections as usual we find that in the east there is a republican majority of 2,485; in the west there is a federalist majority of 6,324; and in Maine a federalist majority of 772. Boston actually went republican by 24 votes—the totals being Gerry, 1555, and Strong 1531. Ind. Ch., April 10, 1800. A comparison of the vote in the three sections of the state during the years 1796, 1797, 1798, 1799, 1800 is as follows:

	East.		West.		Maine.	
	Fed.	Rep.	Fed.	Rep.	Fed.	Rep.
1796.....	4,193—	8,090	4,850—	3,251	1,141—	3,853
1797.....	6,143—	5,648	5,795—	2,625	2,602—	2,415
1798.....	7,113—	1,627	6,134—	304	4,251—	236
1799.....	11,277—	6,388	7,699—	730	5,097—	1,576
1800.....	8,197—	10,682	9,550—	3,226	3,883—	3,111

The totals being 1796: 10,184—15,194; 1797: 14,540 to 10,788; 1798: 17,498 to 2,167; 1799: 24,973 to 8,694; 1800: 21,620 to 17,019.

[Adams'] patronage has been indeed very efficacious, and his friends have been in favour of Gerry."²⁵

The most striking fact, however, is that the largest federalist vote was given by western Massachusetts.²⁶ Henceforth from this section above all will come that large federalist majority which in no small measure served to give to that party its remarkable and unique lease of life in Massachusetts. For twenty-nine years, without exception, the western counties rolled up a federalist majority,²⁷ at times, indeed, to the salvation of the party. To what conditions, then, may this unbroken

(25) Boston, April 16, 1800. *Am. Hist. Assn. Rep.* I (1896), 836.

Josiah Quincy attributed his defeat for congress in 1800 by William Eustis to this same factional fight among the federalists. Quincy: *Life of Josiah Quincy*, pp. 60-7.

(26) 6,224. In the east a minority of 2,485 and in Maine a majority of 772. It must be remembered that the heart of this portion of the state (Hampshire County, which gave the largest majorities actually and relatively) was settled but a few years after the coast towns. Moreover for a long period it was separated from the rest of the state by a large stretch of comparative wilderness. Thus it developed by itself and—isolated—conservatism became entrenched there holding its ground against innovation of every sort. Shays' Rebellion is the one exception which proves the rule. A remarkably vivid picture of the isolation and conservatism of the typical western Massachusetts town about 1800 is given in: Quabbin [Enfield] the Story of a Small Town, by F. H. Underwood. [Boston, 1893.]

Berkshire, the most western of the counties, is the only part where the democrats are numerous enough to carry the county at times. This county, unlike Hampshire and Worcester, is a new county largely settled after the Revolution and therefore, like the District of Maine, would have a natural leaning towards Democracy. Politics in Berkshire county, as well in the other counties of western Massachusetts after 1806 were further complicated by the opposition between the Congregationalists and the other sects especially the Baptists and the Methodists. This question indeed reached by no means so acute a pitch as it did in Connecticut where the downfall of the federalist party is partly to be traced to his trouble, but after 1800 there is quite a decided relation in western Massachusetts at least between the democratic vote in towns and where there were what may be called "dissenting ministers," e. g. in the gubernatorial election of 1816 this fact is noticeable by taking the various returns of the towns and comparing them with the yearly register of the clergy. Further, three of the four leaders of the county under discussion were decided democrats. Bacon and Skinner were two, while Rev. Mr. Allen with his "*Pittsfield Sun*," (established in 1800 in Pittsfield) wielded a great influence. Cheshire, which sent the famous cheese to Jefferson (Holland's *Hist. of West. Mass.*, II:478), was largely Baptist.

(27) There is almost a pathetic interest in the federalist majority vote of western Massachusetts during the last two years of that party's existence. In 1823 the federalist majority was only 658. This was the smallest ever given. As a matter of fact save for the first year, 1796, the federalist majority was never less than 3,000 and often much larger. The republican vote which had been averaging between eight and seven thousand the past six years suddenly jumped in this year, 1823, to 12,137—the federalist being 12,745. The republican candidate won out the next year, 1824 (the last year that the federalist put a state ticket in the field), this faithful section increased its vote from 12,895 to 15,147, the republicans rising only from 12,137 to 13,221. All this was in vain, for in eastern Massachusetts there was an adverse majority of over 6,000, the federalist vote being there 17,276 and 19,063 in 1823 and 1824 while the republicans rolled up a vote of 20,365 and 25,429 in the same years.

record of federalism be attributed? The general reasons which brought about the growth of the party in this state have been discussed. What, then, were the factors which belong especially to western Massachusetts? To answer this question it will be necessary to recapitulate briefly the history of that portion of the commonwealth.

The social and political changes which took place in Massachusetts during the first half of the eighteenth century were much greater in the eastern than in the western division of the colony. In the coast towns there was a marked increase in wealth; new ideas obtained a foothold, and the professional classes, other than the clergy, who suffered a decline, made large gains in influence and power. In the western half, the ascendancy of the clergy, though that order was deprived of its direct political power through the broadening of the franchise by the charter of 1691, continued nearly as paramount as in the previous century. In this somewhat isolated region, for even the so-called trading towns of the Connecticut valley did little business with the outside world, the sober currents of life moved sluggishly, quickened only by the French wars and theological discussions, which culminated in the great revivals. So these inland towns continued in their quiet unprogressive ways until the stirring events which preceded the Revolution broke in upon their peaceful seclusion. It was the upheaval of war which for the time being submerged or drove out the conservatives²⁸ and left the people too largely to the guidance of the radical and untrained elements.²⁹ Undoubt-

(28) "The reason why the New England states are worse governed than heretofore is, that men of sense [and]..property have lost much of their influence by the popular spirit of the war. People once respected their governors, their senators, their judges and their clergy; then laws were obeyed, and the states were happy in tranquillity." *Mass. Gazette*, Dec. 8, 1786, from the *Conn. Courant*, Nov. 27, 1786.

(29) "Since the war, blustering ignorant men..started into notice during the troubles and confusion of that critical period, have been attempting to push

edly the reason why western Massachusetts was so completely given over to false prophets was that she not only had lost her natural leaders,³⁰ but that she was unable or unwilling to replace them.³¹ Many of the latter had suffered greatly in the esteem of the people through adherence to the Tory party.³² To the temporary decline in the power of the clergy, two causes contributed; one, the fact that not a few ministers became odious on account of their loyalist

themselves into office, and have turned the clamours against British tyranny against their own governors." Ibid.

(30) Western Massachusetts had—a little before the outbreak of the war—lost "that great trio...John Pynchon of Springfield...Samuel Partridge of Hatfield [and John Stoddard of Northampton who "stood at the head" of this triumvirate of leaders and were called the "River Gods"]...which ruled, or led, Western Massachusetts through an entire century of its history." Holland, *Hist. of West. Mass.*, II:252. In accounting for political sentiment in any portion of New England the remarkable influence which men of acknowledged position had over their neighbors must not be neglected. E. g. in the *Hampshire Gazette*, Dec. 1, 1802, the reason is set forth why Essex County (South) is democratic, namely because of the "Great Crowninshield family."

This marked evidence of respect is shown nowhere more clearly than in the method of seating families in church, a fashion which was universal during the colonial period and indeed lingered in some towns well into the 19th century. An excellent example of the New England gentry is the account of Mr. Henry Brownfield (in the *New England Magazine*, N. S., vol. II, especially page 18) for whom it was the people's custom—even in the second decade of the 19th century—to remain seated until he and his family had left the church.

(31) The only prominent patriot leader of western Massachusetts was Hawley of Northampton, but his work was completed at the outbreak of the Revolution and after that he lived in retirement. Holland, *Hist. of Western Mass.*, II:253. The only prominent conservatives are Theodore Sedgwick, who did not come into sight until after Shays' Rebellion, and Caleb Strong. The most radical leader was Samuel Ely, of West Springfield, who was only a temporary element of discord, being driven from the state as a reward for the Hampshire riots of 1782. *Centinel*, June 10, 1795. Shays of Pelham, Parmenter of Pelham, and the Days of West Springfield—thoroughgoing demagogues all of them—were prominent during the lean years of the Shays' Rebellion period. Afterwards Bacon and Skinner of Berkshire were the leading democrats of that county, the former was the sole state senator to vote for the Virginia Resolutions of 1798, and his opinions, political and religious, "veered with the wind," while the latter looted the treasury when State Treasurer. William Lyman, of undistinguished abilities, was the republican member of Hampshire County in the National House, until it became federalistic in 1796.

(32) In 1775 only two lawyers remained in Worcester county because the others, being Tory, had left. *Mass. Hist. Soc. Proc.*, 1869-70, p. 48. As for Berkshire see *ibid.*, 1864-65, p. 346. Letter of J. Andrews. The leading citizen of Springfield, Col. Worthington, leaned to Torism and completely lost his influence. Holland: *Hist. of Western Mass.*, II:135-6. The leading men of Hatfield, Deerfield, Amherst and Sheffield, were Tories. *Ibid.*, II:235; Sheldon: *Hist. of Deerfield*, pp. 738-49. Holland: *Hist. of Western Mass.*, II:166-7, 584. Deerfield seems to be particularly infested with Loyalists even towards the close of the war. See the motion made by its representatives in the legislature. *Diary of Wm. Pynchon*, p. 86. This raised a great deal of alarm and "certain Justices in each county are empowered...to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act, in case...that any towns or persons shall dare instruct their representatives as Deerfield hath done, or [the writer was a conservative] be guilty of speaking or...[thinking] too loud against either wind or tide of politics..." p. 88. See also Sheldon: *Hist. of Deerfield*, pp. 738-48. Apparently there were still a number of avowed Loyalists in Springfield who exulted when reverses occurred to the American armies.

proclivities³³—in some towns they were the only adherents of Great Britain—the other the fact that many towns possessed no minister during the war period,³⁴ while poverty and Shays' Rebellion later disturbed the relation between others.

Shays' Rebellion had two results in western Massachusetts, both of which are of great importance. It thoroughly discredited those unprincipled and restless demagogues who excited seditious animosities against law and order from the close of the Revolution, and even before, until 1787.³⁵ Furthermore, the collapse of that dangerous and widespread movement led to the emigration, especially to Vermont, of literally hundreds of the most restless, debt-ridden and shiftless of the population.³⁶ Western Massa-

See Mass. Spy, June 15, July 13, 21, 1780. Many references can be found in the newspapers regarding the hated Loyalists. See e. g. Ind. Ch., Aug. 1, 8, 1782; Mass. Gazette, Feb. 26, 1788; Centinel, Oct. 22, 1791; Fed. Spy, May 21, 1793. A powerfully vindictive sermon was preached against the Loyalists by Rev. N. Whitaker at Salem in May, 1783. The text was "Thus saith the Lord, because thou has let go a man out of thy hand whom I appointed to utter destruction, therefore thy life shall go for his life, and thy people for his people." In the Mass. House Journal, Feb. 9th, 1781, p. 301, there is a list of sixteen alleged "Tories." Out of this number thirteen are from western Massachusetts. Of this number four are doctors, one a captain. There is an account of the Berkshire Loyalists (who were generally prominent) in the Berkshire Hist. Soc. Coll. II (1892) 111-4. "William William was the most prominent and important personage in the county, north of Stockbridge," "a conservative" and lost his influence as a result. Eli Parsons of Berkshire a violent, unprincipled fellow is typical of the kind of demagogues who flourished after the Revolution and misled the people. His proclamation after the dispersal of the rebels at Petersham is most bloodthirsty.

(33) In the counties of Hampshire and Berkshire there were no less than eight whose opinions were so outspoken as to lead to their dismissal. Holland: Hist. of Western Mass., I:224; II:66, 167, 356, 381, 401, 434, 447-8.

(34) In the counties of Hampshire and Berkshire there were thirty-nine towns which had no minister during the Revolution, six only a part of that period and thirty-three which had a minister. The source of information is the second volume of Holland: Hist. of Western Mass., *passim*.

(35) Centinel, May 10, 1788. The change which is beginning is noted in *ibid*, April 26, 30, 1788. The year before the prevailing tone of conservative observers had been exceedingly pessimistic. Gen. Knox's letters are peculiarly hopeless regarding the common people's political capabilities and even rudiments of honesty. See also S. Higginson to N. Dane, Boston, March 3, 1787. Am. Hist. Assn. Rep. I (1796) 754. Also J. Q. Adams to John Adams, June 30, 1787. Adams: Life in a N. E. Town, 1787-1788, pp. 119-120, footnote. By 1790 however even Stephen Higginson is willing to admit that a very great change has taken place in regard to "Habits of industry & frugality [which] are taking the place of those of luxury and dissipation, more generally & with more celerity than I expected, it is a growing Idea, that the manners contracted during the War must be done away with." To Knox, Boston, April 1, 1790. Knox MSS., XXVI:25.

(36) Minot: pp. 156-8. The Massachusetts Gazette (March 20, 1787) says: "Major Cookson informs that not less than 700 families, inhabitants of the three western counties of this commonwealth have, within about six weeks past,

chusetts was thus to a great extent purged of those citizens most easily responsive to agitators and loud-mouthed political brawlers. Boston replaced her conservative elements lost in the Revolution by many of the country gentry, who were of a more conservative tone than those who had ruled the state as well as Boston society. Western Massachusetts, on the other hand, could draw on no such reserves. It had to abide the growing up of a generation which politically and religiously fell more or less under the influence of the clergy after they had regained something of their diminished prestige.

Now whatever political heresies had abounded in the western half of the State, religious heresies and much more irreligion, failed to find much of a foothold there.³⁷ The whole religious history of Massachusetts, from the time of the Antinomian conflict, is a more or less open contest between liberalism and conservatism in religion. Active as the clergy in general were in combating errors of politics and atheism, the ministers of the western portion had an added impulse to be on their guard and to include heresy as not the least of the dangers. For Unitarianism had since the Revolution threatened orthodoxy.³⁸ Indeed, from early times, liberalism on the coast had been a constant menace to the orthodox brethren. Harvard of old had been a place of learn-

removed into the state of Vermont." This was a result of Shays' Rebellion. See also *Hampshire Chronicle*, Oct. 8, 1788.

(37) It may be a mere accident, but yet it is very significant of the prevailing feeling in Western Massachusetts that the Grand Jury of Hampshire County should in their Address to the President, Sept. 3d, descant on the "system of [atheistical] opinions..propagated..with a zeal and vigilance which would have done honor to any cause.." *Greenfield Gazette*, Nov. 3, 1798. In the addresses of the Grand Jury of Dutchess County (N. Y.) (*Ibid.*, Oct. 13, 1798,) of the same of Charleston District, (S. C.) (*Newburyport Herald*, Nov. 6, 1798) and even that of Bristol County (eastern Mass.) (*ibid.*) there is no mention of religion. Only from Western Massachusetts could the following imagery most easily have come: "Beware..of the Madison scheme..Behold him exalted on the top of Pisgah with a Jacobin at his elbow tempting him to curse the people whom the LORD vouchsafed to bless! Nothing but the Genet maniac can equal the madness of the Virginia Prophet." *Hampshire and Berkshire Chronicle*, March 25, 1794.

(38) See Appendix N.

ing of ill-repute, as the founding of Yale testifies. A striking instance of the grip which religion still had on western Massachusetts is the petition of sundry persons of Hampshire and the adjoining counties, in 1762, for a college to be located in that part of the state, the well-known cause of this request being Harvard's alleged saturation with heretical doctrines.³⁹ The founding of Amherst College as a refuge for Congregationalism, among other reasons, proves that western Massachusetts, as late as 1826, had relaxed from Puritan rigidity far less than the coast.

The history of the federalist party in Massachusetts continues along the same lines, and its persistence is due largely to the same conditions which gave it potential victory in 1796 and actual in 1797 and onwards. The politico-religious zeal of the clergy—indeed their bigotry—is continued after 1800 and is displayed with so much animosity towards the republican party, especially Jefferson, as to cause his Postmaster-General to write a series of most vituperative articles against them.⁴⁰ An extract will suffice to show the intense hatred and bitterness engendered.⁴¹ "Some of the [clergy] . . . forgetful of primitive purity, under a pretence of serving religion and obeying its ordinances, have by calumnies,

(39) Quincy: Hist. of Harvard College, II:105-11. Even Yale did not escape contagion. In 1752 a reform was proposed and precautions taken. Ibid, II:70-1. The early dislike of the orthodox for Harvard is described in *ibid*, I:314-6.

(40) See Appendix O.

(41) The loathing with which the clergy of New England regarded Jefferson is continually cropping out. The Rev. John Crane's sermon on March 7th, 1802, at Northbridge, is on Jereboam which is the scriptural designation for the President. It was a very favorite theme. See also his sermon on Feb. 28th, 1802, at the same place. Among the host of hostile sermons see Parish, E., A discourse delivered at Byfield. Nov. 29, 1804. Salem, 1805; Lyman, Joseph. The Two Olive-Trees; or, Religion the leading qualification of Civil Rulers and Christian Ministers, illustrated in a Sermon preached at Hatfield, November 4th, 1804. [Also bound with it a Thanksgiving Sermon—of like import—delivered November 29th, 1804.] See also Story, Life and Letters of J. Story, I:96, 105, 129. Another example among many which might be cited is Stickney: Autobiography of Amos Kendall, p. 73. At Groton "the Clergyman's text was 'ye are of your father, the Devil; and the works of your father ye will do.' The theme of his discourse was a comparison of the President of the United States to Beelzebub, the Prince of Devils, and the members of Congress who voted for the war, to the subordinate devils who do his bidding."

misrepresentations and baseness, with a turpitude of heart, black and gangrened, been laboring to overwhelm, to sink to scorn and execration, a faithful and a virtuous administration. The experiment has been made, with a fury which chose to be blind, and a perseverance which exceeds the ordinary measure of obstinacy. Indecency has had no bounds, and labor no respite. Contrivance directed effort, and exertion followed stratagem. All were planning, and all were acting in the same moment. Combination encircled combination, convention communicated with convention—Synods leagued with Synods, sectaries and seminaries, all combined in a system of obloquy, to bear down with odium the President and his confidential officers.”⁴² Another quotation from the same series is more explicit.⁴³ “The Palladium

(42) The clergy professed to be unable to understand why their political preaching met with such a violent reception at that time. In the American Revolution, they reminded their hearers, not only was their activity loudly applauded but it was besought most eagerly by the leaders of that period. For the complaints over this bewildering change, see e. g. Kirkland, J. T., Boston, May 9, 1798, p. 18; Porter, E., Brookline and Roxbury, May 9, 1798, p. 22.

However light broke upon them later for the Rev. Mr. Stillman in his Fast Day Sermon, April 25, 1799, asserts: “The objection..does not lie so much against the preaching, as against the politics they (the ministers) preach..we have sufficient proof in the warm attachment..they evince to the political preaching of Mr. Allen, of Pittsfield..” *Hampshire Federalist*, April 8, 1807. Both parties abused the clergymen who differed in sentiments: “The Clergy.. are with a few infamous and disgraceful exceptions, warmly attached to the Washington and Adams system of policy—Parson Bently may weekly send forth his hundred lies in the Salem Register..Parson Allen may publish columns of slander in the Pittsfield Sun—Parson Leland may exhibit his ‘Politicks Sermonized,’ in every log hut and grog shop in the state..” *Ibid*, Oct. 7, 1806. The *Hampshire Gazette*, April 23d, 1806, remarks: “The Clergy have been the object of..[the Spy’s] particular virulence, and because there are no democratic clergymen in this county [Hampshire], that order of men have been condemned in the gross.”

(43) This bitterness did result in separation of churches and sometimes dismissal of the pastor. See A Concise and Simple Narrative of the Controversy between Thomas Allen, A. M., of Pittsfield, and that Part of his Church and Congregation which have lately separated from his Pastoral Care.. Pittsfield, 1809. This was a pungent reply to a pamphlet putting forth in peppery fashion the grievances of the federalist malcontents of his congregation, who could no longer endure their pastor’s political predilections which they alleged were openly and persistently manifested even in prayers at the bedside of the sick and dying. Rev. Nathaniel Porter was dismissed for federalistic activity. Allen: *Am. Biog. Dict.*, p. 673. How the federalist papers teemed with invectives against France and the republicans or Paine for atheism and irreligion can be seen by taking the *Political Repository* or *Farmers’ Journal*. This paper, a weekly, was printed at Brookfield, Worcester Co., the first number appearing Aug. 14, 1798. The following numbers contain one or more references or attacks on the above subjects: Aug. 14, “Jacobins..Long have you panted to receive a ‘Fraternal hug,’ from Rebels against God, and the avowed enemies of man.” Other such remarks are to be found in Aug. 21, 28, Sept. 4, 18, 25; Oct. 2, 9, 23, 30; Nov. 6, 13, 20, 27; Dec. 11, 1798. The same is generally true of the *Political Focus*—

...was in bundles sent to the Federal clergymen of Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Connecticut, . . . accompanied by a lengthy note . . . designat[ing] . . . in explicit terms . . . [the administration of Jefferson] as uniformly opposed to the wise measures of the late administrations, as manifesting hostility or indifference to the sacred and civil institutions of their forefathers. It described 'Jacobinism . . . as spreading with alarming rapidity in . . . [Massachusetts],... In the political [activities of the clergy] . . . which are every day disgusting [the people] we foresee the downfall of the federal clergymen. Already has the forgiving spirit plead for the clergymen seventy times seventy . . . the clergy of New England, with many distinguished exceptions, are opposed to their Government... they borrow, from holy time, opportunities of aspersing [Government]... and of alienating from it the confidence and affections of the subjects.'⁴⁴

However incredulous the present may be of the authority then wielded by the clergymen of New England, the republicans of that time (and who should know better) were unanimous from 1795 onward in the firm and outspoken opinion that the strength of

a weekly—started at Leominster, Worcester county, which was first issued June 28th, 1798.

(44) The writer—of the Church and State. A Political Union formed by the Enemies of Both—admits that this book excited "an unprecedented clamor... throughout New-England..." and that the author of it was "denounced as an infidel etc. etc." p. 51.

As a matter of fact it is to these numerous assaults upon religion and in a less degree upon the clergy that the revival of religion at the end of the century and the marvelous growth and activity of missionary societies is largely undoubtedly to be attributed. See the Mass. Gazette, May 3, 1797; Brief Account of the late Revivals of Religion in New-England. Windsor, Vt. 1800; M'Knight, John: A Sermon preached before the New-York Missionary Society.. New York, 1799, esp. pp. 62-4; Emmons, N., A Sermon preached.. November 29, 1800. pp. 21-2, 26; also a sermon by the Rev. Alvan Hyde before the Congregational Missionary Society of the Berkshire and Columbia (N. Y.) counties at Stockbridge in 1813. In Hovey: Life and Times of the Rev. Isaac Backus there are extracts from his diary which show the state of religion in 1784 and onwards. The change in tone at the end of the century is very marked.

the Federalist party in Massachusetts was due in a very great measure to that order.⁴⁵

(45) A writer in the Hampshire Gazette—March 21, 1804—in an address “To the Citizens of New-England” says: “The rude attacks upon the New-England clergy have the same object in view. Smite the shepherds and the sheep shall be scattered.—The Clergy, it is truly said..are federalists.” The Federal Spy—May 4, 1802, from the Salem Gazette—remarks that “the National Aegis [of Worcester—Levi Lincoln’s organ] enraged at the success of Mr. Strong’s election [as Governor], falls afoul of the Clergy as the cause of it..”

See Henry Adams’ account of the alliance between the pulpit and the bench and the power of the clergy in his History of the United States, I:79-80.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The newspapers of Massachusetts have been the main source. (So far as circulation or frequent quotation or both, the Walpole, N. H., and the Hartford, Conn., papers should be included.) The following list comprises the ones chiefly made use of:

- American Apollo, Boston.
 - American Herald, Boston.
 - Columbian Centinel, Boston.
 - Connecticut Courant, Hartford, Conn.
 - Continental Journal and Weekly Advertiser, Boston.
 - Federal Orrery, Boston.
 - Federal Spy, Springfield.
 - Greenfield Gazette, Greenfield.
 - Hampshire Chronicle, Springfield.
 - Hampshire Gazette, Northampton.
 - Impartial Herald, Newburyport.
 - Independent Chronicle and Universal Advertiser, Boston.
 - Massachusetts Gazette, Boston.
 - Massachusetts Mercury, Boston.
 - New Hampshire Journal or The Farmer's Weekly Museum, Walpole, N. H.
 - Political Repository or Farmer's Journal, Brookfield.
 - Salem Gazette, Salem.
 - Thomas's Massachusetts Spy or American Oracle of Liberty, Worcester.
 - Western Star, Stockbridge.
- [See Goddard, D. A. Newspapers and newspaper writers in New England, 1787-1815. Boston, 1880.]
- Neither the printed nor unprinted collections of

letters contain as much of political importance as might be supposed. In the first place, politicians were cautious because of the somewhat insecure state of the mail facilities and secondly the bitter political battles made it imprudent to commit their feelings to paper. Jefferson to John Taylor, Montecello, Nov. 26, 1799, Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll. 7th Ser. Vol. 1. pp. 67-8: "But I cease from this time during the ensuing twelve months to write political letters, knowing that a campaign of slander is now to open upon me, & believing that the postmasters will lend their inquisitorial aid to fish out any new matter of slander they can to gratify the powers that be." See also Jefferson: Writings, IX:412; Works, X:22, 59, 63, 85, 100. Furthermore, there has been a deliberate suppression and destruction of letters by relatives and interested persons. The Knox Letters of the New England Historical and Genealogical Society, the Wolcott Letters in the Connecticut Historical Society and the Samuel Adams Letters in the New York Public Library are very valuable. Perhaps the two most useful printed sources—for the number of letters which they contain—are King's *Life of King*, which contains many letters of C. Gore, etc., and Ames' *Works of Fisher Ames*. There is a great dearth of adequate biographies. The biographies of Adams and Hancock in the *Great Americans of History* series are valueless, likewise W. C. Burrage's *Hancock*. Many of the leaders indeed have found no one to chronicle their lives. The two foremost leaders of the earlier period, Hancock and Bowdoin, have had scant treatment. Gill, Sumner [see N. E. Hist. Gen. Reg. VIII:105-128], the Cushings, Dalton [see Essex Institute Hist. Coll. XXV:1-29], Gère, Lincoln, Gorham and Sedgwick have been even more neglected. The interest of Samuel Adams' biographers is naturally before the close of the Revolution.

Thus in J. K. Hosmer's *S. Adams* only 36 pages out of 431 concern Adams' life after 1780. Amory's *Life of Sullivan* and Austin's *Life of Gerry* obviously could not be absolutely impartial. Parson's *Life of Parsons* and Lodge's *Life of Cabot* are open to the same criticism. Caleb Strong, eleven times governor of Massachusetts, has been treated simply in *Studies in History*, (Boston, 1844,) by Lodge. Quincy's *Josiah Quincy* is valuable, but hardly touches this period. Timothy Pickering's connection with state history is after 1800. Taylor's *Life of Samuel Phillips* is of little value for political history.

The printed sermons used have been indicated in the bibliography, which is arranged alphabetically. The votes for governor and lieutenant-governor for the years 1780-1800 are complete (save for the years 1783 and 1784) in manuscript at the State House in Boston. The votes which still exist of these two years are the original returns from the several town selectmen. These are far from complete in 1784 and fragmentary in 1783. In 1795 Berkshire County is omitted. For the years 1780, 1781, 1782 the county of Dukes and Nantucket made no returns.

There are several works which are valuable for the social life of the period, *e. g.*, Lund, G., *Old New England Traits*, N. Y., 1873; Scudder, H. E., *Men and Manners in America One Hundred Years Ago*, N. Y., 1876; Scudder, H. E., *Recollections of Samuel Breck*, Phila., 1877; Sullivan, William, *Public Men of the Revolution*, Phila., 1847 (this seems to be a reprint of his *Familiar Letters*, Boston, 1834, 2d ed.); *The Memorial History of Boston*, Vols. III and IV, Boston, 1890; Warren, E., *The Life of John Warren*, Boston, 1874.

Biographies and General Works (only the more important are referred to).

Adams, C. F., ed. *Life and Works of John Adams*. 10 vols. Boston, 1850-1856.

Adams, John Quincy. *Life in a New England Town. 1787-1788. Diary of John Quincy Adams*. Boston, 1903.

Ames, Seth. *Works of Fisher Ames*, Boston, 1854. (Supersedes the edition of 1809. The letters are invaluable for giving a picture of Federalism somewhat tinctured with "Essex Juntoism" from 1789 to 1807.)

Amory, T. C. *Life of James Sullivan*. 2 vols. Boston, 1859.

Austin, J. T. *The Life of Elbridge Gerry*. 2 vols. Boston, 1828-9.

Bowdoin, James and Temple, John, *Letters of*. Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll. Sixth Series, Vol. IX, 1897. Seventh Series, Vol. VI. Pt. 2. 1907. (Of small value for state politics.)

Cushing, H. A. *History of the Transition from Provincial to Commonwealth Government in Massachusetts*, Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, Vol. VII, No. 1. N. Y., 1896.

Drake, F. S. *Life and Correspondence of Henry Knox*. Boston, 1873.

Gibbs, G. *Memoirs of the Administration of Washington and John Adams*. N. Y., 1846.

Harding, S. B. *The Federal Constitution in Massachusetts*. Harvard Historical Studies. Vol. II. N. Y., 1896.

Hazen, C. D. *Contemporary American Opinion of the French Revolution*. Johns Hopkins University Studies. Extra Volume XVI. Baltimore, 1897.

Higginson, T. W. *Life and Times of Stephen Higginson*. Boston and N. Y., 1907.

Holland, J. G. *History of Western Massachusetts*. 2 vols. Springfield (Mass.), 1855.

Jameson, J. F., ed. *Letters of Stephen Higginson, 1783-1804*. *Am. Hist. Assn. Report*. I (1896) 704-841.

King, C. R. *Life...of Rufus King*. 6 vols. N. Y., 1894-1900.

Lodge, H. C. *The Life and Letters of George Cabot*. Boston, 1895.

Love, W. De L. *Fast and Thanksgiving Days in New England*. Boston, 1895.

Minot, G. R. *History of the Insurrections in Massachusetts*. 2nd ed. Boston, 1810.

Oliver, F. E., ed. *The Diary of William Pynchon ... a picture of Salem Life a Century Ago*. Boston, 1890.

Parsons, T. *Memoir of Theophilus Parsons*. Boston, 1849.

Sumner, W. H. *Reminiscences of Governor John Hancock*. (Reprinted from the *N. E. Hist Gen. Reg.* VIII:187-189. April, 1854.)

Thatcher papers. *Historical Magazine*, Vol. 6, 2nd ser. 1869.

Wells, W. V. *The Life...of Samuel Adams*. 3 vols. Boston, 1865.

Winthrop, R. C. *Address before the Maine Historical Society (on James Bowdoin)*. Boston, 1849.

SERMONS.

The order of the sermons is primarily chronological, but whenever there are two sermons or more the order is alphabetical as well. The location of the sermons cited is in the Congregational Library, Congregational House, Boston, Mass.; American Anti-quarian Society; Princeton Theological Seminary; and the libraries of Harvard and Yale Universities and Amherst College. Unless otherwise stated the place where the sermon was delivered was in Massachusetts. The towns now in Maine have brackets about the abbreviation of that state.

1790.

Emmons, Nathaniel. A discourse delivered November 3, 1790...at Franklin. Providence, R. I., n. d.

1793.

Robbins, Chandler. Address delivered at Plymouth, on the 24th day of January, 1793, to the Inhabitants...Assembled to celebrate the Victories of the French Republic...[at] the civic Festival... Boston, 1793.

McKeen, Joseph. A Sermon preached on the Public Fast...in Massachusetts, April 11, 1793 [at Beverly]. Salem, 1793.

Tappan, David. A Sermon delivered...in Cambridge...and...in Charlestown, April 11, 1793. Boston, 1793.

Lyman, Joseph. The Administrations of Providence full of Goodness and Mercy. A Sermon delivered at Hatfield, November 7th, A. D. 1793... Northampton, 1794.

1794.

Roby, Joseph. A Sermon delivered at Lynn... April 17, 1794. Portland [Me.], n. d.

Robbins, Chandler. A Sermon preached at the General Convention of Congregational Ministers in Boston, May 29, 1794. Boston, 1794.

Emerson, William. A Discourse delivered in Harvard College.... July 4, 1794. Boston, 1794.

Lathrop, Joseph. The Happiness of a Free Government and the Means of preserving it: Illustrated in a Sermon... July 4th, 1794 [at West Springfield]. Springfield, 1794. Reprinted at Suffield, Conn., 1804.

Elliot, John. A Sermon delivered on the day of Annual Thanksgiving, November 20, 1794 [at Boston]. Boston, 1794.

Mellen, John. A Sermon delivered at Barnstable... on the Annual Thanksgiving, November 20, 1794. Boston, 1794.

Osgood, David. The Wonderful Works of God are to be remembered. A Sermon delivered... [at Medford] November 20, 1794. Boston, 1794, three editions; reprinted at Stockbridge, Newburyport and Albany, N. Y. 1795.

Thatcher, Thomas Cushing. A Sermon preached at Lynn, November 20th, 1794... Boston, 1794.

Channing, Henry... A Sermon delivered at New London, November 27, 1794. New London, Conn. 1794.

Bradford, Alden. Two sermons upon... Christ, delivered in Cambridge, December 28, 1794. Boston, 1795.

1795.

Andrews, John. A Sermon delivered [at Newburyport] February 19, 1795, being a day of Public Thanksgiving throughout the United States of America. Newburyport, n. d.

Baldwin, Thomas. A Sermon delivered February 19, 1795...[at Boston]. Boston, 1795.

Barnard, Thomas. A Sermon delivered...February 19, 1795 [at Salem]. Salem, 1795.

Bradford, Ebenezer. The Nature and Manner of giving Thanks to God, Illustrated. A Sermon delivered...February 19, 1795 [at Rowley]. Boston, 1795.

Clark, Pitt. On the Rise and signalized Lot of the United Americans. A Sermon delivered February 19, M,DCC,XCV...in Norton. Boston, 1795.

Dana, Joseph. A Sermon delivered February 19, 1795...[at Ipswich]. Newburyport, 1795.

Deane, Samuel. A Sermon preached February 19, 1795... [at Portland (Me.)] Portland, [Me.] 1795.

Fiske, Thaddeus. Thanksgiving and Prayer for Public Rulers, recommended in a Discourse, delivered....in Cambridge, February 19, 1795. Boston, 1795.

Frisbie, Levi. A Sermon delivered February 19, 1795 [at Ipswich]. Newburyport, n. d.

Holmes, Abiel. A Sermon on the Freedom and Happiness of America; preached at Cambridge, February 19, 1795...Boston, 1795.

Kendal, Samuel. A Sermon delivered [at Weston] .. February 19, 1795. Boston, 1795.

Lathrop, Joseph. National Happiness illustrated in a Sermon, delivered at West Springfield, on the nineteenth of February, 1795. Springfield, 1795.

McKnight, John. The Divine Goodness to the United States of America...A Thanksgiving Ser-

mon preached in New York, February 19, 1795. New York, 1795.

Mellen, John. The Great and Happy Doctrine of Liberty. A Discourse, delivered at Hanover... February 19, 1795... Boston, 1795.

Morse, Jedidiah. The Present Situation of other Nations of the World, contrasted with our own. A Sermon delivered at Charlestown... February 19, 1795. Boston, 1795.

Murray, John. The Substance of a Thanksgiving Discourse delivered... in Boston, February 19, 1795. Boston, 1795.

Osgood, David. A Discourse delivered February 19, 1795, [at Medford]. Boston, 1795. [Love; Fast and Thanksgiving Days of New England, (p. 560) says: reprinted at Litchfield, Conn., n. d.]

Packard, Hezekiah. The Plea of Patriotism. A Sermon preached in Chelmsford... February 19, 1795. Boston, 1795.

Sampson, Ezra. A Discourse delivered February 19, 1795 [at Plymouth]. Boston, 1795.

Smith, Samuel Stanhope. The Divine Goodness to the United States of America—A Discourse... delivered... in Philadelphia on... the 19th of February, 1795. Philadelphia, 1795. It was printed entire with the notes in the Hampshire Gazette, March 25, April 1, 1795.

Story, Isaac. A Sermon preached February 19, 1795, [in Marblehead]... Being the Federal Thanksgiving, appointed by our beloved President, and Illustrious George Washington, Esq... Salem, 1795.

Tappan, David. Christian Thankfulness Explained and Enforced. A Sermon delivered at Charlestown... February 19, 1795. Boston, 1795.

Thatcher, Thomas. A Discourse delivered... in Dedham, 19th of February, 1795. Boston, 1795.

Wadsworth, Benjamin. America invoked to praise the Lord. A Discourse [at Danvers]...February 19, 1795. Salem, 1795.

Ware, Henry. ...A Sermon delivered February 19, 1795 [at Hingham]... Boston, 1795.

West, Samuel. A Sermon delivered...February 19th, 1795, [at Boston]. Boston, 1795.

Bradford, Ebenezer. The Nature of Humiliation, Fasting and Prayer explained. A Sermon delivered on the day of Public Humiliation and Prayer in... Massachusetts, April 2, 1795; with an Appendix, in Answer to Dr. Tappan's Remarks on his Thanksgiving Sermon, dated February 19, 1795. Boston, 1795.

Thayer, Nathaniel. A Sermon delivered on... April 2, 1795 [at Lancaster]. Boston, 1795.

Cummings, Henry. A sermon preached at Billerica, June 28, 1795. Boston, 1795.

Dwight, Timothy. A Sermon delivered on the 7th of July, 1795, before the Connecticut Society of the Cincinnati. New Haven, n. d.

Barnard, Thomas. A discourse on Natural Religion delivered [at]...the University in Cambridge, September 3, 1795. Boston, 1795.

Gardner, Francis. A Sermon delivered on the Day of the Annual Thanksgiving, November 19, 1795, [at Leominster]. Leominster, 1796.

Gillet, Eliphalet. A Sermon preached at Hallowell, [Me.]...November 19, 1795. Hallowell, [Me.] n. d.

Osgood, David. A Discourse delivered [at Medford]...November 19, 1795. Boston, 1795.

Strong, Jonathan. A Sermon delivered....November 19, 1795, [at Randolph]. Boston, n. d.

Belknap, Jeremy. Dissertations on the Character, Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ and the Evidence of his Gospel; with Remarks on some Sentiments advanced in a Book entitled "The Age of Reason." Boston, 1795.

Woodruff, H. N. A sermon preached in Boston at the ordination of the Rev'd Clark Brown [to]...the Church...in Machias...[Me.]. Boston, 1795.

1796.

Harris, Thaddeus Mason. The New Year's Wish ...January 1, 1796. Boston, 1796.

Barnard, Thomas. A Sermon delivered at Salem, on March 31, 1796, the day of General Fasting... Newburyport, n. d.

Barnes, David. A Discourse....delivered...at Hingham, April 5th, 1796. Also...in Scituate. Boston, 1803.

Belknap, Jeremy. A Sermon delivered before the Convention of the Clergy of Massachusetts, in Boston, May 26, 1796. Boston, 1796.

Lathrop, Joseph. Steadfastness in Religion, explained and recommended in a Sermon. [Delivered Aug. 25, 1796, at West-Springfield.] West-Springfield, 1797.

Fiske, Nathan. A Sermon preached at the Dudleyan Lecture in the Chapel of Harvard College, September 6, 1796. Boston, 1796.

Austin, Samuel. A Sermon delivered at Worcester on the day of Public Thanksgiving...of Massachusetts, December 15th, MDCCXCVI. Worcester, 1797.

Barnard, Thomas. A Sermon delivered...[at Salem] December 15, 1796. Salem, n. d.

Cumings, Henry. A Sermon preached at Billerica, December 15, 1796... Boston, 1797.

Emmons, Nathaniel. National Peace the Source of National Prosperity. A Sermon delivered at Franklin...December 15th, MDCCXCVI. Worcester, 1797.

Freeman, James. A Sermon for December 15, 1796, [delivered at Boston]. Boston, 1796.

Hyde, Alvan. A Sermon delivered at Lee, December 15th, 1796. Stockbridge, 1797.

Wadsworth, Benjamin. Social Thanksgiving a Pleasant Duty. A Sermon preached on...December 15, 1796, [at Danvers]. Salem, 1797.

1797.

Hitchcock, Enos. A New Year's Sermon delivered at Providence, January 1, 1797. Providence, R. I., 1797.

Lathrop, John. A discourse delivered at the Public Lecture [at Boston] on Thursday, March 16, 1797. Boston, 1797.

Lathrop, Joseph. God's Challenge to Infidels to Defend their Cause, illustrated and applied in a Sermon, delivered in West Springfield, May 4, 1797. Being the day of General Fast. West Springfield, n. d.

Tappan, David. A Sermon delivered before the Annual Convention of the Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts, in Boston, June 1, 1797. Boston, 1797.

Cary, Thomas. A Sermon delivered at Charlestown, July 23, 1797. Charlestown, n. d.

Strong, Nathan. A Sermon preached at [Hartford, Conn.] at the Annual Thanksgiving, November 16th, 1797. Hartford, Conn., 1797.

Kellog, Elijah. A Thanksgiving Sermon delivered in Portland [Me.] November 30, 1797. Portland, [Me.] 1797.

1798

Tappan, David. A Discourse delivered...in... Boston, and....Charlestown, on April 5, 1798. Being

the day of the Annual Fast in...Massachusetts. Boston, 1798.

Strong, Nathan. A Sermon preached on the State Fast, April 6th, 1798, [at Hartford, Conn.]. Hartford, Conn., 1798.

Belknap, Jeremy. A sermon delivered [at Boston] on the 9th of May, 1798, the day of the National Fast... Boston, 1798.

Bradford, Alden. Two Sermons delivered in Wiscasset (Pownelborough) [Me.], on the 9th of May, 1798. Wiscasset, [Me.] 1798.

Emmons, Nathaniel. A Discourse delivered May 9, 1798 [at Franklin]...Wrentham. 1798. Reprinted, Newburyport, n. d.

Harris, Thaddeus Mason. A Sermon preached in Milton...and at Dorchester...[on] the 9th of May, 1798... Boston, 1798.

Kirkland, John Thornton. A Sermon delivered on the 9th of May, 1798 [at Boston]...Boston, 1798.

McKeen, Joseph. Two discourses delivered at Beverly...May 9, 1798. Salem, 1798.

Morse, Jedidiah. A Sermon delivered...in Boston...and in...Charlestown, May 9th, 1798... Boston, 1798.

Osgood, David. Some Facts evincive of the atheistical, anarchical, and in other respects, immoral Principles of the French Republicans, stated in a Sermon delivered [at Medford] on the 9th of May, 1798.... Boston, 1798.

Porter, Eliphalet. A Discourse delivered at Brookline...and at...Roxbury...[on] the 9th of May, 1798... Boston, 1798.

Prince, John. A Discourse delivered at Salem... May 9, 1798... Salem, 1798.

Thayer, John. A Discourse delivered...in Boston on the 9th of May, 1798... Boston, 1798.

Wilder, John. A Discourse delivered [at Attleborough] May 9, 1798... Wrentham, 1798.

Osgood, David. A Discourse delivered before the Annual Convention of the Congregational Ministers ...in Boston, May 31, 1798. Boston, 1798.

Dwight, Timothy. A Discourse delivered at New Haven, July 4th, 1798. New Haven, 1798.

Kirkland, John T. An Oration delivered at the Request of the Society of Phi Beta Kappa, in the chapel of Harvard College, July 19, 1798. Boston, 1798.

Abbot, Abiel. A Memorial of Divine Benefits. In a Sermon, delivered at Exeter, on the 15th, and at Haverhill, on the 29th of November, 1798, days of Public Thanksgiving, in New Hampshire and Massachusetts. Haverhill, 1798.

Buckminster, Joseph. A discourse delivered...in Portsmouth [N. H.] November 15, 1798... Portsmouth, N. H. 1798.

Gray, Robert. A Discourse delivered in Dover [N. H.] November 15th, 1798. Dover, N. H. 1798.

M'Farland, Asa. A Sermon delivered at Concord, New Hampshire...November 15, 1798. Concord, N. H. 1798.

Allyn, John. A Sermon delivered at Duxbury on the 29th of November, 1798, the day of Public Thanksgiving in...Massachusetts. Boston, 1798.

Camp, Samuel...A Discourse delivered at Ridge-way, [Conn.] on the day of Public Thanksgiving; November 29, 1798. Danbury, Conn., 1799.

Cummings, Henry. A Sermon preached at Billerica, November 29, 1798... Boston, 1798.

Eckley, Joseph. A Discourse delivered [at Boston] on...November 29, 1798. Boston, 1798.

French, Jonathan. A Sermon delivered [at Andover] on...November 29, 1798... Andover, 1798.

Messer, Asa. A Discourse delivered on...the 29th of November, 1798, at...Rehoboth. Providence, R. I. n. d.

Morse, Jedidiah. A Sermon preached at Charlestown, November 29, 1798... Boston, 1798. Worcester, 1799.

Spring, Samuel. A Thanksgiving Sermon, preached [at Newburyport] November 29, 1798. Newburyport, 1798.

Strong, Nathan. ...A Sermon preached [at Hartford] on the State Thanksgiving, Nov. 29, 1798. Hartford, 1798.

Taylor, John. A Sermon delivered...at Deerfield; Nov. 29, 1798. Greenfield, n. d.

Lathrop, Joseph. A Sermon on the Dangers of the Times from Infidelity and Immorality and especially from a lately discovered Conspiracy against Religion and Government... [Delivered at West-Springfield and afterward at Springfield.] Springfield, 1798.

1799.

Miller, Samuel. A Sermon delivered February 5, 1799; recommended by the Clergy of the City of New York, to be observed as a day of Thanksgiving, Humiliation and Prayer, on account of the removal of [the Yellow Fever]... New York, 1799.

Dana, Daniel. Sermons on John VI:29 and Ephesians IV:30 delivered...March 24th, 1799, [at Newburyport]. Newburyport, 1800.

Baldwin, Thomas. A Sermon, on....April 2, 1799, at a Quarterly Meeting of several Churches for Special Prayer, [at Boston]. Boston, 1799.

Frisbie, Levi. The Nature and Effects of the Works of Darkness Detected and Displayed in two Discourses, delivered at...Ipswich, April 4, 1799, on the Anniversary Fast Day throughout...Massachusetts. Newburyport, 1799.

Woods, Leonard. Two Sermons on Profane

Swearing, delivered [at Newbury], April 4, 1799. Newburyport, 1799.

Packard, Hezekiah. Federal Republicanism Displayed in Two Discourses preached [April 4]... at Chelmsford, and on [April 25] the day of the National Fast at Concord...1799. Boston, 1799.

Cummings, Abraham. The present Times perilous. A Sermon preached at Sullivan, [Me.]... April 25, 1799. Castine, [Me.] n. d.

Cutler, Manasseh. A Sermon delivered at Hamilton...April 25, 1799... Salem, 1799.

Dana, Daniel. Two Sermons delivered April 25, 1799 [at Newburyport]... Newburyport, 1799.

Dana, Joseph. The Duty and Reward of loving our Country and seeking it's Prosperity. A Discourse delivered...April 25th, 1799. Boston, 1799.

Emmons, Nathaniel. A Discourse delivered [at Franklin] April 25, 1799. Wrentham, 1799.

Gillet, Eliphalet. A Discourse delivered at Hallowell, [Me.] April 25, 1799... Hallowell, [Me.] 1799.

Holmes, Abiel. A Sermon preached at...Boston, and at Cambridge, April 25, 1799... Boston, 1799.

Lathrop, John. Patriotism and Religion. A Sermon preached [at Boston] on the 25th of April, 1799... Boston, 1799.

Morse, Jedidiah. A Sermon Exhibiting the Present Dangers, and Consequent Duties of the Citizens of the United States. Delivered at Charlestown, April 25, 1799. Charlestown, 1799, [Love: Fast and Thanksgiving Days of New England, p. 571, says: reprinted at Hartford, 1799. New York, 1799.]

Osgood, David. The Devil let Loose, or The Wo occasioned to the Inhabitants of the Earth by his wrathful appearance among them, illustrated in a Discourse delivered...[at Medford] April 25, 1799. Boston, 1799.

Stone, Eliab. A Discourse delivered at ReadingApril 25, 1799. Boston, 1799.

Weld, Ezra. A Discourse delivered [at Braintree], April 25, 1799...Boston, 1799.

Harris, William. A Sermon...in Boston, before the Annual Convention of the Protestant Episcopal church in Massachusetts...20th of May 1799. Boston, 1799.

Forbes, Eli. The inoffensive Ministry described in a Sermon, delivered before the Convention of the Clergy of Massachusetts in Boston, May 30, 1799. Charlestown, 1799.

Parish, Thomas. A Discourse Delivered at Medfield...July 4, 1799. Dedham, 1799.

Morse, Jedediah. An Address to the Students at Phillips Academy...July 9, 1799. Charlestown, 1799.

Woods, Leonard. A Contrast between the Effects of Religion and the Effects of Atheism...delivered at...Harvard University...July 17th, 1799. Boston, 1799.

Mellen, John. A Discourse on Natural Religion delivered in the Chapel of Harvard College, September 4th, 1799. Boston, 1799.

Abbott, Abiel... A Sermon delivered at Haverhill on the Twenty-eighth of November, 1799, the day of Anniversary Thanksgiving. Haverhill, 1799.

Eaton, Peter. A Sermon preached at Boxford, November 28, 1799...Haverhill, 1799.

Sumner, Joseph. A Sermon preached at Shrewsbury, November 28, 1799... Brookfield, 1800.

APPENDIX A.

Commutations Before Shays' Rebellion.

Grave troubles of a lawless and dangerous kind were being excited in Hampshire county especially. Led by an unfrocked minister, one Samuel Ely, a turbulent fellow, whose life was passed in opposing authority, (in 1796 he is in Maine exciting riots) a mob on April 18, 1782, attempted to break up the sittings of the Supreme Judicial Court and the Court of Common Pleas at Northampton. Holland: Hist. of Western Mass., I:231. The ring leader, Ely, was arrested and placed in jail at Springfield. A mob released him. The leaders of this riotous proceeding were lodged in the Northampton goal. On June 15th, another lawless gathering to the number of 300 assembled at Hatfield demanding the release of the rioters locked up in Northampton. After a parley the demands were complied with. Conn. Courant, June 25, 1782; Ind. Gazette, July 20, 1782, from the Springfield, and Northampton Advertiser; Conn. Journal, June 27, 1782. The Tories were accused of being at the bottom of these outbreaks. Royal Gazette, June 22, 1782. To quiet these turbulent proceedings the legislature appointed a committee to proceed to the disaffected part of the state, inquire into the grievances and pacify the uneasy feelings. Wells: S. Adams, III:159-163. This attempt was only temporarily successful.

The next year, May 20th, another attack was made at Springfield on the courts. But the rioters were well hustled by the law abiding, and the ring leaders, with broken heads, were jailed. Conn. Gazette, June 6, 1783. Ind. Gazette, June 4, 1783; Conn. Journal, Aug. 27, Sept. 3, 1783, which chronicles more riotous proceedings at Northampton. D. Sewell to S. Adams, Worcester, Oct. 15, 1783: "Last year the court were directed to hold a Session at Berkshire principally, as was supposed, on Account of some Riots, that had then been lately Committed there...At this Term a Number..of the Rioters came in and plead Guilty..one Major Thomas Lusk acquainted the Court that he obtained a statute pardon. Those who pled Guilty this Term, desired that Sentence upon them might be suspended until next Term, that they might..have Opportunity of applying for a Pardon which they had reason to expect to succeed in. S. Adams Mss. N. Y. Public Library; Salem Gazette, Oct. 24, 1782. D. Sewell to S. Adams, Springfield, Sept. 26, 1783: "The Peace of these Western Counties will be greatly aided by the Stability, & Attention..of the Court..more than thirty Rioters were convicted by Verdicts at Worcester and many more remained to be noticed..The Grand Jury..have a great deal of previous matter before 'em..." S. Adams Mss. N. Y. Public Library. Conventions, as might be expected, were held at Hatfield, Oct. 20, and Deerfield, Sept. 20, 1782; in Worcester County on April 14 adjourned to May 14. Lincoln: Hist. of Worcester, p. 31.

The previous year conventions did meet or were expected to meet at Shutesbury, Jan. 30th; Hatfield, the first Tuesday in April; at Worcester, April 9th, adjourned to May 14th and then to August (26 towns were represented Stowe: Hist. of Hubbardston, p. 55), and again in Hatfield, probably by adjournment in late August or early September. Hampshire County enjoyed these meetings the next year (1783) at Hatfield, March 19, Oct. 20; Hadley, March 25, April 15, 16, 17, [S. Judd Mss. notes in Forbes Library, Northampton, Mass.] and at Springfield the second Wednesday of June. Crafts: Hist. of Whately, p. 235. In 1784 the convention fever had begun to arouse Worcester and Middlesex counties. Conventions held at Worcester, March 3, April 20. The latter drafted a petition and list of grievances which was sent to the legislature. N. Y. Gazette, April 14, 1784; Haywood: Hist. of Westminster, p. 194; Stowe: Hist. of Hubbardston, p. 55. When, however, the towns of Wrentham and Medway circulated a letter calling for a county convention, Boston emphatically disapproved. U. S. Chronicle, March 25, 1784. Ind. Gazette, April 17, 1784. A convention was also held at Concord. Drake: Hist. of Middlesex Co., I:392; Ind. Ledger and Am. Ad. April 12, 1784. In the Pa. Mercury for Sept. 24, 1784, there is a communication depicting vividly the distress prevalent in Western Massachusetts. For the third time an attempt is made to break up the court at Springfield. The militia turned out in force on this occasion (Oct. 5) and prevented trouble. Boston Gazette, Oct. 11, 1784; Conn. Journal, Oct. 20, 1784.

The next year Boston experienced commotions. Owing to the depression in trade and the fact that what trade there was had fallen into the hands of British factors, opposition arose. On April 13th, 1785, an inflammatory

address to the people signed by "Joyce, Jun.," counseled violence against these obnoxious intruders. Pa. Packet, May 11, 1785. The next day a meeting was held at the Green Dragon—the tavern for the democratically inclined—by the Boston merchants. Ibid., May 14, 1785. On the 16th a mob destroyed several chariots imported from England. Ibid., June 17, 1785. This fashion of considering grievances in assemblages spread as far as Maine. D. Brooks to Knox, Medford, Dec. 25, 1785. Knox Mss. XVIII:120: "Our friend Putnam has just arrived from the eastward. He informs me of the great uneasiness existing among the people [there]...below Penobscot [they] have recently set on foot a memorial to the Legislature praying for a redress of grievances."

By some strange coincidence a peaceable convention [gathered according to the article of the Bill of Rights of the Massachusetts Charter of 1780 wherein "the people have a right in an orderly and peaceable manner, to assemble to consult upon the common good: Give instructions to their representatives: and to request of the legislative body, by the way of addresses, petitions or remonstrances, redress of the wrongs done them, and of grievances they suffer." Poor: Constitutions. I:957, Art. III. of Pt. I.] did result in the latter half year of 1786 almost invariably in disorder rather than order, in appeal more often to mob rule than by petition to the legislature. E. g. The Hatfield convention sat from Aug. 22d to the 25th; the Leicester convention met by adjournment Aug. 15th, 16th, 17th. Ind. Gazette, Sept. 9, 1786. Five Middlesex towns came together June 29th, adjourning to Aug. 23d. Am. & Charlestown Recorder & Advertiser, July 29, 1786. At Lenox, a similar gathering was held the last of August, while twenty towns of Middlesex County met at Concord, Aug. 23d, Ind. Gazette, Sept. 25, 1786. Then riots, in quick succession broke out, leaving only Suffolk (Boston), Essex, Plymouth, Dukes and Nantucket (the small island county) and Maine outwardly quiet. The Worcester county convention was held Sept. 26th. Ibid., Oct. 23, 1786. During October all the Bristol County towns save one met and forwarded a petition to the legislature; Minot, p. 53. The same was done by 41 towns of Worcester County; Centinel, Oct. 14, 1786; and by 18 of Middlesex; Drake, Hist. of Middlesex County. I:392. County conventions were not the only steps taken. This Worcester convention received a delegate from the Bristol meeting, and appointed a committee to correspond with other counties. Manifestly matters began to look serious, for that most effective Revolutionary machinery, Committees of Correspondence, was being put into working order again. Minot, p. 53. Col. Bonney of Hadley the same month invited delegates to meet him, evidently in response to the Worcester committee. Ind. Gazette, Nov. 20, 1786. A convention was held early in November at Hadley. Centinel, Nov. 11, 1786. And a convention, at which Hampshire and Bristol Counties were represented, sat at Worcester, Nov. 19-23. N. Y. Gazette, Nov. 30, Dec. 7, 1786.

The last convention of all seems to be the one held at Hatfield, Jan. 4th, which was adjourned to March 3rd. Centinel, Jan. 17, 1787. The following letter describes from a hostile standpoint the cause and effect of a county convention of this period. D. Sewall to G. Thatcher, York, [Me.] Oct. 16, 1786: "the...small Politicians...stir up a County Convention and by Trumpeting lies from Town to Town get one collected and consisting of Persons of small Abilities—o' little or no property, embarrassed in their Circumstances—and of no great Integrity—and the Geniuses vainly conceiving they are competent to regulate the affair of the State—make some hasty incoherent Resolves, and these end in Sedition Riot and Rebellion." Hist. Mag., Vol. VI., 2nd ser., p. 257.

APPENDIX B.

Shays' Rebellion.

An outline will tend to show what a dangerous uprising this so-called Rebellion really was. On July 2d, 1786, a paper was circulated in Bristol County pledging the signer's fortune—and life even—to prevent the sitting of the Court of Common Session. Ind. Gazette, Aug. 26, 1786. On Aug. 29th, 1786, the Northampton Riots occurred which stopped the Courts. Germantown Zeitung, Sept. 19, 1786. The next week 300 rioters stopped the courts at Worcester. Minot, p. 28. Sept. 2d, Gov. Bowdoin issued a proclamation against the rioters. Pa. Packet, Sept. 12, 1786. Sept. 10th, 11th, Great Barrington Riots. The courts stopped by 800 insurgents. New Haven Gazette, Sept. 28, 1786. Sept. 11th, 12th, Concord riots. A mob of 300 stopped the courts. N. J. Gazette, Oct. 2,

1786. Sept. 11th, the courts at Taunton protected by Gen. Cobb. Militia at first numbered only 100 men, later 300, while the mob had about 400. Freeman's Journal, Sept. 27, 1786. Sept. 22d, the courts at Charlestown held under the protection of two companies of artillery with several companies under marching orders. Pa. Packet, Oct. 8, 1786. To protect the courts at Springfield, 120 militia ordered out. The next day insurgents gathered, but Northampton militia reached Springfield, Sept. 25th. Both sides increased to 300. On the 26th, the numbers had doubled, and on the 28th the insurgents had from 1,200 to 2,000, while the militia were 600 to 800. The court though protected did no business, and prudently decided not to proceed to Berkshire. Minot, pp. 47-9. In anticipation of the October session of the Supreme Judicial Court at Great Barrington, a mob assembled but the learned judges did not appear, being minded not to run unnecessary risks. Pa. Packet, Oct. 26, 1786. A general gaol delivery determined upon by Uxbridge patriots on Oct. 9th, was prevented by Worcester citizens. N. Y. Gazette, Oct. 16, 1786. An attempt to steal the cannon on Dorchester Heights frustrated. Pa. Packet, Oct. 26, 1786. On Oct. 24th, 25th, although a mob appeared the courts were protected. Centinel, Oct. 28, 1786; Ind. Gazette, Nov. 20, 1786. Finally the Riot Act was passed Oct. 26th, by the legislature convened in extra session. Centinel, Nov. 1, 1786.

The first vigorous action of the state now occurred on Nov. 1st, when the court was held at Cambridge guarded by 2,000 troops, commanded by Maj. Gen. Brooks. A review was held at which the governor was present. Centinel, Nov. 4, 1786. So general was the alarm that Boston took precautions against attacks. N. Y. Gazette, Nov. 18, 1786. It was again necessary to guard the courts at Taunton because of the presence of 200 rioters. Centinel, Nov. 15, 1786. A grand convention was held at Worcester, Nov. 19th-23d, where even Hampshire and Bristol County delegates were present. N. Y. Gazette, Nov. 30, Dec. 7, 1786. Continued until the 23rd because of the sitting of the courts on the 21st, which was prevented. Centinel, Nov. 29, 1786. Their address is in Minot, p. 71-2. On Nov. 27th, the Middlesex mobbers or regulators as they styled themselves—ibid, p. 71—assembled at Concord, but dispersed. Ibid, p. 75. Despite the orders issued by Gov. Bowdoin to the Major general to see that the militia be equipped and in readiness to march—ibid, pp. 73-4—the insurgents between Nov. 27th and Dec. 8th, gathered at Shrewsbury with Cambridge as their object point, 350 being under Shays, 200 under Day from Springfield and 500 being stationed at Rutland on Dec. 1st. N. Y. Journal, Dec. 20, 27, 1786. By the 5th of December there were about 1,000 insurgents billeted in the town of Worcester, where they behaved peaceably. On the 9th they dispersed. Ind. Gazette, Dec. 26, 27. Meanwhile the government had broken up the malcontents in Middlesex by seizing the leaders, Parker, Page and Shattuck, and had appeased the rioters in Bristol county, (Minot, pp. 76-8) and the courts at Cambridge were again protected by large bodies of troops. King: King, I:197. A collision occurred at Northampton between citizens and insurgents. Pa. Packet, Jan. 1, 1787.

The action of Shays on Dec. 26th in stopping the court at Springfield was in the eyes of the government the last straw. Ibid, Jan. 9, 1787. Gov. Bowdoin dispatched Gen. Lincoln, who left Boston, Jan. 20th, in order to protect the courts at Worcester on the 23rd. Meanwhile the insurgents had been gathering above Springfield investing it on all sides except for the south road to Hartford. Day with 400 men held West Springfield. Centinel, Jan. 24, 1787. Shays with 1,100 was posted east of Springfield on the Boston road. Parson commanded 400 stationed in the north parish of Springfield. To oppose these and guard the arsenal and the stores, Gen. Shepard had only about 400 men. Gen. Knox had expressed a great deal of anxiety about the safety of these government stores (see Knox Mss, XIX:20, 23.). To seize these stores on Jan. 25th Shays advanced, was fired upon, lost three dead, one wounded and retreated in confusion to Ludlow. Minot, pp. 110-112. The next day 650 men under Wheeler left New Braintree to join Shays. Centinel, Feb. 3, 1787. In the evening of the same day the advance guard of Gen. Lincoln's army—one regiment and some cavalry reached Springfield. Shays retreated to Pelham and there entrenched himself. Lincoln followed and a parley ensued. Feb. 3d-4th the insurgents retreated to Petersham, 1,500 strong. At 8 P. M. Lincoln started in pursuit and after a remarkable march all night upon the high plateau of that region in the teeth of a blizzard, reached Petersham early in the morning and surprised and scattered the insurgents. Minot, pp. 131-4.

The serious opposition was ended by this bold stroke. On March 6th, e. g. the courts were held at Northampton "without the usual interruption." Conn. Courant, March 12, 1787. By the fall "the late Discontents seemed to appear exceedingly

anxious, and were making great exertions .to discharge not only the present but the back taxes." Conn. Gazette, Oct. 5, 1787. Isolated bands of insurgents were met with and dispersed, usually without loss; at Stockbridge 100 dispersed on Jan. 27th. New Haven Gazette, Feb. 15, 1787; at Middlefield 80 were seized, rest scattered on Jan. 29th. Minot, pp. 117-8; Worcester county scoured by light horsemen Jan. 28th. Centinel, Feb. 3, 1787. At Norwich-Bridge insurgents seized. Ind. Gazette, Feb. 19, 1787. At New Braintree insurgents scattered, Pa. Packet, Feb. 20, 1787; at West Stockbridge 200 driven off; at Adams a gathering dispersed before Gen. Patterson who was rounding up the rebels (since on Feb. 4th, the legislature reluctantly declared that a rebellion existed, Pa. Packet, Feb. 17, 20, 1787) New Haven Gazette, Feb. 15, 1787. At Lee, on Feb. 6th, 250 insurgents opposed by 300 citizens in a bloodless encounter, Minot, p. 144. At Brookfield 36 rebels captured. Centinel, Feb. 14, 1787. Feb. 10th, at Williamstown, 14 rebels taken, 6 at Dalton, Minot, pp. 144-5. Other bands seized. Pa. Gazette, Feb. 2d, 1787. The severest engagement occurred at Sheffield. The insurgents, reinforced by "broken men" from the wilds of New York state and Vermont stood their ground at first, but finally fled, leaving 2 dead, 30 wounded and 50 captured. Of the militia 2 were killed, 1 wounded, and 2 died from fatigue and exposure. Centinel, March 7, 1787; Minot, pp. 149-50. Minor outrages take place after this for several months, New Haven Gazette, April 16; N. J. Journal, April 25; Pa. Journal, May 2, June 20; Centinel, May 2; N. J. Journal, June 13; Ind. Gazette, June 16; Md. Journal, June 19; Centinel, June 23, 30, July 4, 18, 1787. Attacks on persons and property still continue in the Berkshire. A final excitement occurred at Great Barrington, Oct. 15th, when insurgents went through the streets hurrahing for Shays and were pursued by indignant citizens. Centinel, Nov. 17, 1787. See Appendix D.

APPENDIX C.

The Election of 1787.

A copy is in the Massachusetts Historical Society. A part of the accusation is: "Mr. H— has sunk, altogether by his Dissipation and Folly, one of the fairest Estates. His Extravagance and Professions are quite proverbial, and the injurious effects of his pernicious example have not yet quite grown out of Fashion, Although the excessive Use of Articles of foreign Ornament, and Dress, is somewhat abated...The Seeds of the present Uneasiness were sown in the Administration of Mr. H—, and arise more from his Negligence, and Want of Abilities, while in Office than from any other Circumstance." See for a similar opinion J. Trumbull to Washington, Lebanon, Conn., Oct. 28, 1788. Sparks: Correspondence of the Revolution, IV:239. All this was too near the truth to be at all acceptable to the people in general, or relished by the friends of the accused. In reply it was argued with great plausibility and doubtless a fair amount of truth that "the people will set more easy under...[Hancock's] administration; for it matters not how worthy the character of our present Governor may be..if prejudice has blinded the eyes of the people, they will never be united under him." Centinel, March 28, 1787. See also Kilham to King, [no date] King: King, II:615.

The accusation that the insurgents are busy electioneering for Hancock is made in the newspapers, e. g. Centinel, March 24, 27, 1787. This tale had been circulated the month before, since "At Shrewsbury I found a most villainous lie inserting itself..that H[ancock] & one of the judges of the Supreme Court were the principal supporters of Chayses [Shays]. Falsehood so daringly asserted & so cautiously invented to ruin Hancock's pretensions, must appear to all but the credulous the weak efforts of a weak party." J. Swan to Knox, Dorchester, Feb. 28, 1787. Knox Mss. XX:2.

The belief that Hancock would favor measures favorable to the debtor was largely held. For example J. Q. Adams writes to John Adams, June 30, 1787: "Mr. Hancock was again elected..It is..concluded that he would favor tender acts, paper currency and all those measures, which would give the sanction of the law to private fraud and villainy." Adams: Life in a New England Town, 1787-1788, pp. 119-120, foot note. Some misguided friend asserted that Hancock's "popularity is established, and his name is ever grateful to its [Massachusetts] rebellious sons." Am. Herald, March 17, 1787.

The angry replies by Hancock's friends, are to be found in (e. g.) Centinel, March 31, 1787; Am. Herald, April 2, 1787. In a squib in the former paper it was cleverly retorted that if Hancock "is beloved by the opposers of government ["This is not the only scandal that is circulated"] it is not likely that

they will disturb this administration, and certainly the friends of peace and good order will not—." In the latter paper Hancock is hailed as "our American Joshua," while Cato harangues the voters in the following persuasive style: "be not duped by the artifices of the Salem Wizard [Stephen Higginson]..your opponents [are]..men of property...To accomplish...["a change in our present Constitution"] they likewise hold out to you Mr. L[incoln] as Lieutenant-Governor.—This ought to alarm you, a military character in either of the first offices is a further step to their aristocratical plans." It would seem that Hancock and Adams had become friends again within the past few months and the latter was held up as Hancock's running mate. *Mass. Gazette*, March 27, 1787; *Centinel*, March 28, 1787. The federalists in general wished Lincoln as the lieutenant-governor.

Adams' advocacy of rather severe measures in Shays' Rebellion was still remembered. "Let the high if not passionate measures, taken by a certain body [the legislature especially the Senate of which Adams was a member] of which he is an active and influential member decide; particularly the disqualifying a[c]t, which..is repugnant to the constitution..has..embittered the minds of thousands, and sent hundreds out of the state. If, after this, if any doubt remains, let the act which he originated, and pushed through the S[enat]e, to destroy the freedom of speech, decide what he is now, and whether he is not fitter for a Venetian Doge than for the second Magistrate in a free republic." *Centinel*, March 31, 1787. While both Cushing and Lincoln are in nomination for lieutenant-governor there is little attention paid to either. In reply to a puff for the former as faithful to both Hancock and Bowdoin (*Centinel*, March 21, 1787) an evident enemy inquired "would he not be as likely faithfully to serve Daniel Shays or Luke Day?" *Ibid*, March 21, 1787. See also *ibid*, March 21, 1787, for the "standing army" accusation. Nevertheless the House on June 1st sent up two names—Thomas Cushing and Nathaniel Gorham—to the Senate. The latter unanimously elected Cushing. *Mass. Gazette*, June 5, 1787. The reason for Lincoln's neglect is explained in a letter from Knox to King, New York, June 8, 1787: "Notwithstanding the number of votes for Lincoln [6,767; Cushing had 10,107] Genl. Warren [Speaker of the House] maneuvered in such a manner that his name was not returned to the Senate.." *King: King*, I:222.

In Worcester County (49 towns) Bowdoin carried not a single town—Plymouth, Bristol, Dukes and Nantucket, likewise. In the large county of Middlesex (40 towns) he carried but one. The same is true of Norfolk and the whole District of Maine. Barnstable and Essex gave him majorities in two towns each only. His strength in Hampshire and Berkshire counties is surprising at first glance: Hampshire (58 towns of which 53 returned votes) Hancock carried 26, Bowdoin 19, Lincoln 7, Gorham 1; Berkshire (24 towns, 21 town votes returned, Cushing carrying one) of the twenty towns left Hancock got 11, Bowdoin 9. This can be only explained on the score that the disfranchising act operated to exclude a large number of his adherents—the insurgents—and that the rest of the people having suffered in these two counties much more than in the rest of the state, were determined to continue in office if possible a more vigorous governor. The election returns seems to bear out fully this disfranchisement. This year—1787—with a good deal of excitement the total vote in Hampshire was 1,943; Berkshire, 899. The next year, 1788, with not so much of a contest [Total vote for governor, 1787, 24,588; 1788, 22,157] the total in Hampshire was 3,006; Berkshire, 1,397. Further, both counties had lost in population during these two years owing to the large number of persons who had emigrated, especially on account of Shays' Rebellion. A letter of Lincoln to Knox, March 1, 1787, is confirmatory: "The act includes so great a description of persons, that..many towns will be disfranchised..will they not now complain, and say that we have cut them off from all hope of redress..for we have denied them a Representation in the Legislative body by whose Laws they must be governed...[the act] is impolitic.." Knox Mss., XX:8. The intention of the act is displayed in a letter from Kilham to R. King, Jan. 2, 1787: The General Court "passed an act disqualifying all who have acted as non-commissioned officers or privates from holding any civil or military or town offices for a term, and conditioned also from being...electors in the choice of any of these offices. This we hope will be security against corruption in the approaching election." *King: King*, II:614. Nor was this all a dead letter. From the complaints it evidently operated among other reasons to drive out of the state hundreds of inhabitants. See Blake: *Hist. of Warwick*, p. 78., for a reference to the imprisonment of the town selectmen who had unlawfully been in office.

APPENDIX D.

The Aftermath of Shays' Rebellion.

A doleful sound comes from Berkshire county June 20th: [See an earlier wall in the Mass. Gazette, May 11.] "Depredations on the property and persons of those who unfortunately have been friends to government in these counties are nightly committed..frequent[ly]..persons..are attacked and beaten..we are exposed to..a civil war. The insurgents plume themselves on having many friends in the government." Centinel, June 30, 1787. Letter from Stockbridge, July 7th: "There is little or no Apprehension of Danger from any publick Opposition.. Some abandoned and desperate Individuals may..perpetrate private thefts and robberies..civil authority [will have more]..salutary effects, than a Military force." Am. Herald, July 10, 1787. [An Administration paper.] Col. Lyman the officer in charge writes from Northampton, July 8: "so many as 500 [troops]..might perhaps be unnecessary..[because of good] prospect of internal tranquility..[and] from the vigilance..[of] neighboring states." Centinel, July 18, 1787. The same paper contains a letter from Great Barrington, July 12th, expressing some hope for quiet but asserting "there was a peculiar propriety in government's resolving to raise troops." Letter of Aug. 2nd: "The accounts from the counties of Hampshire and Berkshire give me great uneasiness." Mass. Gazette, Aug. 17, 1787. The next day in the Centinel is published an opportune letter from a traveller of Springfield who finds that the erstwhile warriors have beaten their spears into plough-shares and pruning hooks and are busily engaged in raising bumper crops. The war scare is over.

Further the "Hancockonians" complained: "A certain Junto (consisting of shy Jesuits) have of late taken great liberties in their remarks on our new administration.." Centinel, May 12, 1787. In *ibid*, May 5, this 'junto' is threatened "with a seat on the GALLOWS, for speaking disrespectful of our Rulers, by 'the smaller sort of folks.'" These are samples of the letters: "Our friends in this county [Hampshire] do not relish the pardons lately granted to the Traitors..I last week saw one of these miscreants he had the audacity publicly to say, that if Government DARED to have hung him, he was sure they would." *Ibid*, May 19, 1787, from Springfield. See also *ibid*, May 2, 1787. Extract of a letter from a western county, Centinel, June 30, 1787: "The Days have returned home in triumph, wearing their side arms; and behaving very insultingly as they passed along. In short, the measures of the present administration have reversed the feelings of the people in this country." Another writer asserts: "They [the petitions for pardon] are not dictated by the least degree of humility; they do not acknowledge the justice of the sentence, but imply strongly, that it will be dangerous to hang any.. Some have conjectured, that the plan of petitioning by the people at large, originated not far from the head of the State.." [A reference to the Stone House Club—see Am. Herald, Jan. 15, 1787—an attack upon whom is made in the Centinel, Sept. 5, 1787. This was Hancock's "Kitchen Cabinet." Sullivan, active in this unofficial council is accused of instigating this petitioning in order to curry favor with the insurgents and to oppose Hancock for governor next year. Centinel, Sept. 22, 1787. Sullivan's reply is in *ibid*, Sept. 26, 1787. He defended certain of the rebels. With some such however he was not in favor because of his large (in their eyes) salary. Mass. Gazette, March 27, 1787.] The above is a part of a letter from Middlesex. Centinel, July 21, 1787. An admirable example is the reputed dialogue between "Insurgents A and B:" "We have many friends in the Cabinet [of Hancock]...as the offences were committed under 'Jemmy's Administration,' [Bowdoin's] a fig for your fears ..[Hancock] was chose by us..upon this tenure..of pleasing US." *Ibid*, July 25, 1787. A violent communication is inserted in the Hampshire Gazette, Oct. 10, 1787, by "Justitia:" "Need any stronger evidence be adduced, than the late 'full and free pardon' to traitors and murderers to prove that there is an object pursuing by certain men in power..diametrically opposed to the best interest of the community. To the grief and chagrin of all good men.. This influence..well known in..[Boston]..[whose] grand inquiry..is not, what is law? what says the constitution? but how stands the thermometer of the popular opinion?" See also Centinel, July 11, 1787.

There was some considerable alarm by the "better sort" over the elections. For example the Massachusetts Gazette, May 18, finds that six representatives returned from Worcester county were known to be active in county conventions, and the American Herald adds three more to this list of undesirables. The

former paper asserts that the senators from Bristol county are of the same sort. April 6. See also *Centinel*, May 5, June 12, 10; *Mass. Gazette*, May 4, 1787. In fact B. Hichborn wrote to Knox, April 8, 1787: "the Senators generally chosen are a miserable set and the good people are much alarmed at the complection of them." Knox Mss. XX:44. J. Q. Adams wrote to John Adams, June 30, 1787: "there are indeed several Senators and many Representatives, who would stick at nothing. A Willard, a Drury, a Whitney, and many others..have openly espoused the cause of treason and rebellion." Adams: *Life in a N. E. Town*, pp. 119-120, foot note. Nevertheless despite the fact that a motion was made and passed to remove the General Court out of Boston—and a committee appointed to find a place chose Concord—their choice was rejected and another attempt was made to leave without permanent result. *Mass. Gazette*, June 15, 29, 1787. Yet "a motion..made a few days since; that a committee should be appointed to examine the merits of a paper currency..[had] a majority of more than 50, even against the committing of it." Adams: *Life in a N. E. Town*, pp. 119-120, foot note. Still to the close of the year's existence of this legislature "in many instances they discovered their old insurgent temper and principles.." Jackson to Knox, Boston, March 15, 1788, Knox Mss. XXI:168. Gorham (to Knox, March 19, 1788), writing of the election of 1788 says: "but such has been the critical situation in the legislature that a number of the good Friends thought the publication of them [The Rhode Island papers respecting her refusal to send delegates to the Constitutional convention] had best be suspended until the Session was over.." Knox Mss. XXI:172. See Lincoln to Washington, Boston, June 3, 1788. Sparks: *Correspondence of the Revolution*, IV:223. What displeased the federalists especially was their attempted reply to the Governor's address praising the Constitution. From a letter of Jackson to Knox, March 10, 1788, it is learned that the House debated the matter two days although the Senate approved of the ratification. Knox Mss. XXI:165. See Harding: *Fed. Constitution in Mass.* pp. 110-113 for an account of this transaction and for the refusal of the House by a final vote of 118 to 2 to concur with the Senate to have the address of the state Constitutional Convention published in accordance with the vote of the Convention. The strongest evidence is presented by their voting on March 7th by a majority of "about 11..for pardoning, and restoring to the privileges of a freeman, the famous Capt. Luke Day who for some time past had been confined in the gaol in..[Boston]." *Centinel*, March 8, 1788. This was evidently to include Shays, Parsons, &c., for the Senate non-concurred. *Ibid.* April 2. Its purpose was to put an end to the trials by the courts of the insurgents who had been caught. Shays and Parsons had escaped out of the state.

APPENDIX E.

Hancock's Bargain with the Federalists.

That the federalists did agree to support Hancock at the ensuing election for governor is proved by the election returns. Except for 10 votes, Boston was unanimous for Hancock. Nor is this all the proof. While it is smoothly assumed (Amory: Sullivan, I:224) that Hancock's popularity "was beyond their power to subvert," the future at that period was not such plain sailing. Hancock had lost for the time being at least the support of the Insurgent party, (Jackson to Knox, Boston, Feb. 3, 1788, Knox Mss. XLI:68,) and this faction controlled the lower house at that time. Their vote was a very large factor in Hancock's support at the previous election. It was uncertain how far the defection had gone. On the other hand the federalists were growing in strength with the aid of the Constitution, which, if adopted, would give them much glory and added power. If both the insurgent party and the federalists nominated candidates it would divide the anti-Hancock opposition it is true, but also undoubtedly give Hancock less than a majority. The election would therefore go to the General Court. What chance would Hancock have in an insurgent House and a Senate controlled by the federalists? Nor was the union of these two bodies upon a mutually acceptable candidate so impossible, for while the federalists probably would never support Warren, Heath or Gerry, it is quite in the line of possibility that Lincoln could have been elected. The latter was very popular, especially in the west for his humane conduct in Shays' rebellion, and the Senate invariably carried its candidate when a difference of opinion occurred.

As for his presidential hopes the veriest tyro in politics would perceive that it was necessary to have the support of that formidable host of ability and influence which arrayed itself in support of the Constitution. Nor is there lacking documentary evidence direct and indirect to prove the fact that a bargain of some sort was consummated between Hancock and the federalist leaders. What could be a stronger proof that Hancock's inveterate enemies had received a quid pro quo for their support, than a letter from Tristram Dalton to — Feb. 3, 1788: "Governor Hancock has hazarded his whole interests to the support of the Constitution..We must, whether successful or not, support his interest. Are you willing that we should pledge yours? Do not say 'I will be damned first. He shall never have my vote.' Will you not if the Judge [Greenleaf], Parsons and myself pledge ourselves?" Essex Inst. Hist. Coll., XXXV:87-8. A letter of T. Dalton to S. Hooper, Boston, Jan. 31, 1788, (ibid, p. 94) is worded significantly: "We are not idle by Night and Day..and sacrifice every thing but moral Honesty to carry our point." While hinting at the bargain in two letters (to Madison, Jan. 30; Feb. 3, 1788; King: King, I:317-8) King comes out flatfooted in a letter to Knox, an intimate friend and ardent federalist: "Hancock has committed himself in our favor and will not desert the cause—You will be astonished, when you see the list of names, that such an union of men has taken place on this question. Hancock will hereafter receive the universal support of Bowdoin's friends; and we told him, that, if Virginia does not unite, which is problematical, he is considered as the only fair candidate for President." King: King, I:319. After the publication of the "Letters of Laco," where it was roundly asserted that Hancock promised his support in return for a "promise to support him in the chair at the next election." Gore writes to King, March 27, 1788: "I am perfectly in opinion with you that the disclosure of anything relative to Mr. H's [Hancock's] conduct during the convention is unjust, ungenerous, & highly impolitic." King: King, I:360. Other evidence is in "an Antifederalist squib published in the Chronicle of March 20, [1788] it is insinuated that 'the man of the people' was gained by holding out to him the office of vice-president." Quoted by Harding: Fed. Constitution in Mass. p. 87.

The manifest anxiety of the federalists to push for Lincoln as lieutenant-governor may well be owing to the fact that if Hancock is elected as president or vice president it would leave Lincoln as acting governor and with the former out of the running, open the path for Lincoln at the next election.

While the coalition of Bowdoin's and Hancock's party put the governorship out of danger, yet the irreconcilable antifederalists put forward Elbridge Gerry for governor and James Warren as lieutenant-governor. The latter was nominated by a "large meeting of the antifederalists..held last week at Dudley in Worcester County & resolved to send messengers into every town in the counties of Worcester, Berkshire, Hampshire & Bristol & Middlesex." Gore to King, March 2, 1788. King: King, I:323-4. This "convention" was in addition to a legislative caucus which "by a great majority of the members" favored Gerry and Warren. The expiring legislature was controlled by men of insurgent-antifederalist proclivities. There was "a printed list forwarded on from our deputy at [the General] court." Centinel, April 5, 1788. A letter from "G."—in Worcester County. In this latter county—as evidently in others—a full list of state senators were put in nomination by the antifederalists. Ibid, April 2, 1788. It is evident from the votes for Lincoln and Adams that the support for the latter—since it was Suffolk and Middlesex counties which gave Adams half his support—came largely from that democratic Austin-Sullivan faction in Boston and vicinity (See Centinel, April 5, 9, 1788, for certain tricks attempted by Adam's supporters) so bitterly hostile to the Higginson-aristocratic-conservative junto. (See the Centinel, March 29, 1788, for attacks on Lincoln—by the former—on the score of the Cincinnati). Nothing could reconcile these two clans of mutually implacable haters. From the end of the Revolution throughout the existence of the Federalist party in Massachusetts they opposed each other on all questions.

The federalists were hopeful but doubtful as to the outcome. Gorham (who was talked of by some so-called federalists) (see a vigorous letter of Gore to King, Boston, March 2, 1788. King: King, I:324.) writes to Knox: "some of our very good Friends think they are sure of bringing in Lincoln provided the business is brought to a point between him & Gen. Warren—I hope they will not be disappointed—but I have my doubts.." Charleston, March 19, 1788. Knox Mss., XXI:172. Jackson writes to Knox, Boston, March 23, 1788: "the only difficulty is that the Federalists will be divided with respect to Mr. S. Adams & Genl. Lincoln, this is what the opposite party are aiming at, and are industrious to effect..The General Court will rise

this week to give the members an opportunity to reach home previous to the Choice, it is the wish of the Federalists that they may be detained here until after the Election, but they are too cunning for that, & are hurrying the business for that purpose—" Knox Mss., XVI:174. See also Centinel, March 19, 1788.

APPENDIX F.

The Treatment of Lincoln by Hancock.

Yet the election in excitable Boston passed off with "the most perfect cordiality and good humour pervad[ing]. every part." Hampshire Chronicle, April 15; Centinel, April 8, 1789. This was unexpected because since the previous summer—besides Laco's bitter attack—there had been much agitation over Hancock's treatment of Lincoln in refusing to appoint him Governor of the Castle. The cause of the controversy is obscure. Its political importance lies in the fact that it resulted in the displacing of Lincoln by Adams as lieutenant-governor in the spring of 1789. It looks as if it was the beginning of another attempt of the federalists—presuming on Lincoln's supposed great popularity, but in which idea they were destined to be sorely disappointed—to supplant the governor with the lieutenant-governor. At any rate their loud complaints, (which are clamorous throughout the state by Aug. 1st. See Centinel of that date) that Lincoln was being badly treated in the matter of that appointment, may have been wholly political. For it was asserted that the governor had determined not to appoint whomsoever was elected to that sinecure. Amory (Sullivan, I:243) asserts that Hancock not only "openly declared" this resolution but he even informed S. Adams of his determination should he—Adams—be elected and that the latter acquiesced. While Amory needs to have corroborative evidence on controversial points in this matter he is backed up by a letter of C. Gore to R. King, Boston, March 2, 1788: "If Gorham pursues this object [the lieutenant-governorship], the emoluments of wh. will now be diminished." King: King, I:324. This is a month before the election. In the same letter—and this is important—it is said that "The Govr. [Hancock] accedes to the vacancy [Thomas Cushing the lieutenant-governor had died] being supplied by Lincoln; this is another point which ought to be attended to by Mr. G[orham] and his friends." It is only fair to say that Amory's story is dwelt upon at length in the Chronicle and the reply in the Centinel of Aug. 9th is that "when it is considered that within a year of the time when this declaration is said to have been made [to S. Adams]—his excellency..continued Gov. Cushing (i. e. the lieutenant-governor of Massachusetts 1780-1788) in this place, this apology..[is] not.. very satisfactory."

Whether simply capriciousness—for which Hancock was noted—or spite, because his chances for the presidency or vice presidency had departed, moved him to deny the fees of the Castle is an unsolved problem. On any score, it was peculiarly mean because Lincoln was without other material resources except as member of the Council for which he received only a small amount. Amory: Sullivan, I:249. John Adams returned to Boston in June and his enthusiastic reception at that time (Centinel, June 18, 21, 1788) may—with other information—have shown how utterly fallacious Hancock's hopes were. Still, he is mentioned in a letter from Philadelphia (Centinel, July 3, 1788, in *ibid*, Aug. 2 and in a Baltimore paper—*ibid*, Nov. 8, 1788) as the probable candidate for the vice-president; Sullivan went on a mission to the South to obtain votes for Hancock (Amory says towards the close of 1788 or the beginning of 1789.) Amory: Sullivan, I:249. John Adams is openly mentioned as a candidate for that office. Centinel, Aug. 20, 1788. This refusal of the governor was considered as a piece of injustice and loudly complained of. See Centinel, Aug. 2, 9, 13, 1788. The General Court took the matter up on November 3rd. and a committee was appointed "to consider what provision may be necessary for the support of the Lieut.-Governor." *Ibid*, Nov. 5, 1788. The committee reported—November 12th.—that the governor should be interrogated on this matter. After a fight the recommendation was agreed to, 82 to 62. Hancock cannily replied that by not appointing any one "there will be..saved to the people a very considerable sum.. annually". *Ibid*, November 15, 1788.

In January the legislature again took the matter up. On the 7th a committee was appointed to consider the support of the lieutenant-governor. On the 10th the committee reported for a £300 salary. It was lost by a vote of 181 to 109. *Ibid*, Jan. 10, 14, 17, 1789. Finally a motion was passed by a majority of four that a salary be granted, motions for £300 and for £250 being lost, although the committee reported that the emoluments from the Castle had amounted on an average to £320 and when

commerce was brisk to £350. Ibid, Jan. 21, 1789. Finally on the 23rd £160 was granted. Ibid, Jan. 24, 1789. This was reduced to £150 the next year. Ibid, June 18, 1789. Meanwhile the governor made himself popular again by signing a bill reducing his own salary to £880. Ibid, Feb. 18, 1789. The inevitable result of this pother was to fix Hancock more strongly in the affections of the people. A resolve which practically censured the governor was smothered by a vote of 83 to 37. Ibid, Feb. 11, 1789. It was hardly consoling to the federalists to compare these "Thirty-seven Worthies" to the "immortal William Tell" in these "cringing times" (Ibid.) for they clearly perceived that Hancock intended to "elevate" Mr. Adams, who, as they reminded him, "has heretofore used all his influence in opposition to [him]...and represented him in the most odious colours, in point of ability and integrity. If this is a just representation must we not feel that our pretended American Cato, has bowed the knee to Caesar? and what must we say, when we are told that Caesar, practices many artifices to favour...Cato"? Ibid, Jan. 10, 1789. There is an excellent satire on the "Star Chamber" in ibid, Feb. 17, 1789. This was apparently a coterie of democrats in the legislature who managed affairs there. The Stone House Club was likewise composed of democrats or republicans, who were the intimates of Hancock. See the Mass. Gazette, March 14, 1788.

APPENDIX G.

Civic Feasts and Other Extravagances.

In the Centinel, Jan. 23, 1793, there is an account of the great number of "Civic Feasts" in Charlestown, Watertown, Roxbury, and other towns. See also Hazen: American Opinion of the French Revolution, John Hopkins Studies, XVI: pp. 165-171; Sullivan: Familiar Letters, p. 37. A discordant note sounded "from a late Hartford paper." "We are told that at a mighty civic feast of equality in Boston, some little distinction was observed by placing citizen such a one and such a one at the head of the table in the hall, and spreading a table out of doors...for fellow citizens of the rabble..But to be consistent let Citizen H[ancock] and Citizen A[dams] be seated at the table cheek by jowl with their citizen butcher and citizen oyster-man." Centinel, Feb. 9, 1793. This fraternal harmony seems to have ended in a slight ebullition of democratic uproar and riot since they "destroyed the benches provided for their accommodation, tore the poor ox piece-meal, broke the plates, and scattered the mingled fragments of beef and earthenware, in every direction, to the destruction of the neighboring windows..The head of the animal was then fixed..on the pole of LIBERTY..it remained until the fate of the unfortunate Louis was announced, when it was seen in mourning...by some was..stripped of its 'suit of solemn black.' In revenge..those who had furnished the mourning levelled the sacred tree of liberty to the ground..The pole was up—and down—and up again..whilst the head..was converted into a punch-bowl..by the democratic society.." Fed. Orrery, May 4, 1795.

In succeeding years feasts were still held, but they were distinctly political rejoicings, and as such were participated in by the republicans only. E. g. in September, 1795, "was celebrated the epoch of the abolition of Monarchy, and of the establishment of the Republic of France. The Dawn of the Day was welcomed in by a discharge of guns from the Brutus, and from the Castle, and by the ringing of all the bells in town. At noon a procession was formed..The Dinner was also honored, by the company of His Excellency Governor Adams." Mass. Mercury, Sept. 22, 1795. Earlier that year a "Fraternal Feast" was held at Boston to mark the "late glorious successes of France, and the restoration of the liberties of our allies the citizens of Holland.. The Governor [Adams] attended." Ind. Ch., April 9, 1795. There is an account (in ibid, April 20) of a "Civic Feast" held at Reading on the 10th including the planting of a Liberty Tree and the singing of the "Marseillais Hymn by a choir." Such town conduct is almost unique at this late date.

The Civic Festival projected for 1794 fell through, probably because that previous pleasing unanimity had been unfortunately displaced by violent rancor the year before. Centinel, March 19, 26, 1794. However the "Fall of the Bastille" was celebrated on July 14th by a procession and a dinner. Ibid, July 16, 1794. With the growth of party feeling these "civic feasts" became "mere engines of party" and were consequently condemned by the federalists and described as mere drunken orgies of the rabble. See account of a Civic Feast, April 6, 1795, in Northampton. Hampshire Gazette, April 8, 1795. A description of such in the Centinel, April

27, 1797, is typical: "The rapid decline of the French party..is nowhere so strongly manifest as at the civic feasts, still ridiculously kept up..In '94 and '95..no decent character except a few weak persons [attended]..In '96 and '97..the..guests..dwindled down to a few..Jacobins, and hungry immigrants, happy to pick up a dinner..the late civic feast procession..was properly a Tri-coloured festival, for it was an appropriate assortment of whites, mulattoes and negroes."

The extravaganzas of the French adherents soon aroused ridicule in Massachusetts, as the following "Republican" advertisement will show: "Citizen John Kelly..bound to the subscriber..by a ci-devant obligation commonly called an Indenture, inspired with the noble love of LIBERTY & EQUALITY..[ran away]. Any possessed of a sufficient quantity of Anti-Republicanism to intercept said Citizen Kelly..shall be rewarded with a 4½ piece, bearing the impression of that arrant aristocrat the King of Spain." Federal Spy, Feb. 26, 1793. In the South "not even a Mr. is allowed to precede a name at the present day—While their sable fellow-creatures are frequently addressed..‘Citizen Caesar,’ or ‘citizen Pompey, clean my boots,’..but to hear the Auctioneer cry ‘twenty pounds for Citizen Alexander—who bids more?’ seems to be carrying the joke too far in a free country." Centinel, Feb. 13, 1793. From Gazette of the U. S. See also Mass. Mercury, March 2, 1793; Federal Spy, Feb. 19, 1793; Hampshire Gazette, Jan. 30, 1793. Liberty Trees and Liberty Poles were much in vogue among these worshippers of liberty in the "fantastic French fashion." A traveller notes "as I entered the town [Newport, R. I.] I perceived a tree, fenced around with painted rails, and 'Tree of Equality' inscribed" thereon. Felt: Memorials of W. S. Shaw, p. 24. These trees were the Lombardy poplar which "In the early part of the French Revolution..was planted at the entrance of every public building." Tudor: Life of James Otis, p. 223, note. "One such mark of respect shown to the Rev. clergy reflects more honor—and more fully demonstrates..good sense, than were ever..exhibited by the deluded idolaters of French massacres and principles, in civic ox feast, carmagnoles, chorisses, and riff-raff processions." From the Centinel, quoted in Contributions to the Ecclesiastical Hist. of Essex Co., p. 104. For other bits of ridicule see Western Star, Oct. 29, 1794; esp. Mass. Spy, March 6, 1794, from the Vermont Gazette. It was considered a triumph for the rights of man and equality when a "free Negro Man" was chosen Town Clerk in Easton, Pa. by a "decided majority," Federal Spy, Aug. 6, 1793. See for another example of nonsense over French abstractions the "Cap of Liberty" in *ibid.* June 18, 1793. For the rapturous applause over the French constitution at the expense of that of the United States see the Ind. Ch., Sept. 3, 1795, and for a reply see the Fed. Orrery, Sept. 7, 1795.

APPENDIX H.

Sermons Descanting on Lack of Religion.

See e. g. Strong, C., Lenox, April 30, 1795. [Stockbridge, 1795]. pp. 25-6. French, J., Haverhill, June 3, 1795 [Haverhill, 1795], p. 22. "The numerous, and increasing errors, and corruption of the word of God, with which the present period abounds.." p. 31. "A melancholy laxness in religious sentiments and morals abounds." Gray, R., Hallowell [Me.] Oct. 21, 1795 [Boston, 1795], p. 33; Backus, C., Wilmington, Vt. Oct. 29, 1795 [Boston, 1795] "Remember that you are set for the defense of the gospel; and live in a day, when not only its doctrines, but its divinity, is called in question." p. 29; Emmons, N., Wardsborough, Vt., Nov. 4, 1795 [Battleborough, Vt., 1797]. "never was there a time..when this malignant disposition [opposition to ministers] was more visible..than..[to]day. A..infidel spirit prevails.." pp. 27-8; Elliot, J., Milton, circ. 1796. "If ministers are men of virtue and knowledge, they will be able to stand against the scepticism of the present age.." p. 21, "As an order of men, the ministers are not respected..as they once were.." p. 33. On p. 38 he refers to "the lawless multitudes, who are trying to extirpate the institutions of Christianity.."; Macclintock, S., Hampton, N. H., Feb. 22, 1797. [Portsmouth, N. H., 1797], p. 1. Harris, T. M., Brookline, March 15, 1797 [Boston, 1797] "In the present age of..infidelity, a general indifference to religion has spread its contagion through our churches." pp. 34-5; Robbins, C., Boylston, June 6, 1797 [Worcester, 1797]. "Arguments of general scepticism are placed before the public in most engaging forms. Every seducing speculation finds an emission from the press.." pp. 33-4. See also pp. 11, 25; Palmer, S., Rowley, June 7, 1797 [Dedham, 1797]. "You enter..upon the work of the ministry in a dark and difficult day; when infidelity prevails, irreligion abounds, and the love of many has waxed cold.." p. 22;

Emerson, J., Granville, June 21, 1707 [Springfield, 1797.] p. 20; Richmond, E., Raby, N. H., Oct. 11, 1797 [Amherst, N. H., 1798.] p. 24; Elliot, J., Milton, Nov. 1, 1797. [Boston, 1797.] A discourse on Infidelity and the Attacks on Christianity; Adams, M., Medway, June 13, 1798. [Dedham, 1798.] esp. pp. 15-16; Fiske, A., Hampton-Falls, N. H. Aug. 15, 1798. [Newburyport, 1798.] pp. 8-9, 14-15, 20, 22; Story, I., Hamilton, Aug. 15, 1798. [Salem, 1798.] "You are engaging in the work of the ministry at a time when infidelity is openly professed—when it is propagated with artful industry." pp. 30-31; Austin, S., Fitchburg, Sept. 17, 1798. [and at Granville, N. Y.] [Worcester, 1798] p. 25; Backus, C., Pelham, N. H. Oct. 31, 1798. [Amherst, N. H. n. d.] p. 29; Osgood, D., A conclusive Argument for the Truth of the Gospel.. Newbury, Dec. 5, 1798 [Newburyport, 1799] esp. pp. 23, 25; Backus, C., The Principal Causes of the Opposition to Christianity Considered.. Leicester, 1798 [Worcester, 1798]; Holmes, A., Sharon, Conn., Feb. 27, 1799, pp. 23, 44-6; Hitchcock, E., Wrentham, June 12, 1799 [Providence, R. I., 1799], pp. 11, 15, 20, 26; Adams, M., Needham, July 10, 1799 [Dedham, 1799]. This sermon is taken up with the growth of atheism and a defence of the political activity of the clergy; Thayer, N., Boston, Oct. 16, 1799 [Boston, 1799], pp. 21, 26-7; Cumings, H., Falmouth [Portland, Me.], Oct. 9, 1799 [Falmouth, (Portland, Me.) n. d.] A general defence of the clergy. Esp. pp. 21, 35; Thatcher, T., Peterborough, N. H., Oct. 23, 1799 [Amherst, N. H., 1800] pp. 13-14; Peabody, S., Ipswich, Nov. 13, 1799 [Haverhill, n. d.] p. 22; Storrs, R. S., Fitzwilliam, N. H., Nov. 5, 1800 [Keene, N. H., 1801] p. 9.

APPENDIX I.

The Attacks Upon Paine and the Age of Reason.

One of the earliest newspaper references to this book is found in the *Western Star*, Nov. 18, 1794. In the *Mass. Spy*, (for Nov. 19, 1794) there is an advertisement of the following books: *Paine's Age of Reason*, *Wakefield's Examination of the Age of Reason*, and *the Age of Infidelity*. In the issues of the *Massachusetts Mercury* for March 13, 17, 20, 1795, there are articles attacking the book. On July 7th, 1795, the *Western Star* has the following books advertised: *Paine's Age of Reason*, *Wakefield's Answer. Age of Infidelity*, *Paine's Trial*, in *Answer to the Age of Infidelity*, *Defense of the Age of Reason*; all on sale at Stockbridge. In the *Independent Chronicle*, Jan. 12th, 1795, there is advertised: *Ten Letters addressed to Mr. Thomas Paine in Answer to his. Age of Reason* by Bishop Watson. There is an extract of this answer in the *Salem Gazette*, July 26th, 1796. See also *Impartial Herald*, Oct. 21, 1796, for a long extract from an English paper. In the *Salem Gazette* for July 12th, 1796, there are "proposals for printing by subscription *Paine's Second Part of the Age of Reason Answered* by James Tytler—author of the remarks on *Paine's* first part of the *Age of Reason* by a *Citizen of the World*, printed at Belfast, in Ireland, 1794." The *Salem Gazette* of August 12th, 1796, announces "Mr. James Tytler, a late Emigrant from Scotland by the way of Belfast, who has taken his present residence in this town...[his book] has [been] given a favourable reception...which may tend to check the progress of [Paine's]...book..." The universal interest and opposition aroused by Paine's attack on Christianity, as it was deemed, is shown by the following, in the second volume of *Swift's A System of the Laws of the State of Connecticut*. "We cannot sufficiently reprobate Thomas Paine...[for] publishing his *Age of Reason*...he undertakes to disturb the world by his religious opinions...no language can describe the wretchedness of the man..." *Mass. Spy*, Sept. 2, 1796, from the *Rutland Herald*. See also the *Farmer's Weekly Museum*, Aug. 23, 1796. In *ibid*, Nov. 29, Paine is called a "popinjay." Dr. Priestly attacked this book likewise "in a preface to his sermons lately published in Philadelphia." *Western Star*, June 28, 1796. See also *Salem Gazette*, June 14; *Political Gazette*, June 16, 1796. In the *Massachusetts Spy*, Dec. 28, 1796, there is an extract from Wakefield's reply to Paine taken from the *Critical Review*. In the *Salem Gazette*, Feb. 3, 1795, is a list of "Excellent books to be read in an *Age of Reason*...Among the best defences of *Revealed Religion* are *Bishop Butler's Analogy of Religion*, *Doddridge's Works*; *Bishop White's Sermons*; *Bishop Watson's Apology for Christianity*." Others advertised are *The Age of Infidelity* [published in London, reprinted (1794) in New York and in Boston]; *The Signs of the Times*, or the *Overthrow of the Papal Tyranny in France* [by J. Bicheno, Providence, R. I., 1794]; *Addison's Evidence of the Christian Religion*; *Jennyn's Internal Evidence of the Christian Religion*, and "his lectures." R. Watson [Bishop of Llandaff] published [reprinted at Portsmouth,

N. H., in 1796] The Bible needs no Apology..and a Short Answer to Paine in Four Letters. Still another was "Mr. Clarke's Answer to the Question, Why are you a Christian?" [2nd ed. Boston, 1795] [which] has found it way to Chebucto..Its merit I shall hope will..shorten the duration of Paine's miserable Age of Reason." A. Brown to J. Belknap, Halifax, [N. S.], Feb. 6, 1795. Belknap Papers, Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll., 6th Ser., IV (pt. III) 585. Rev. Charles Backus preached five sermons in 1797 on the truth of the Bible. There is an "Answer to the Age of Reason by Thomas Scot of England which has reached North Vineyard, Me., by 1800—a town of 60 people—of only 15 four years before." Coll. Me. Hist. Soc., IV (1856), 396. See also p. 352. Gilbert Wakefield's *An Examination of the Age of Reason* [reprinted at Boston, 1794] is considered almost as heretical as the book it pretends to condemn. Extract from Dr. Linn's Discourses on the Signs of the Times [N. Y., 1794] quoted in the Independent Chronicle for Dec. 15th, 1794: "I consider..[it] as having a more pernicious tendency than the Age of Reason itself..he..join[s] with Mr. Paine, in sneering at the history of Jonah..his defence of Christianity..may..be called insidious." Rev. Jedidiah Morse had the same opinion, see ante p. 105, n. 54. The Rev. Elhanan Winchester published [Boston, December, 1794] an answer to the Age of Reason. Jackson: Hist. of Newton, p. 507. The Salem Gazette, June 9th, 1797, says: "Much has been justly said of Bishop Watson's 'Apology for the Bible,' but too much cannot be said of his 'Address to Young Persons after Confirmation,' of which an edition has been printed at Philadelphia." The Farmer's Weekly Museum—Oct. 11, 1796—has a quotation from Watson's Answer to the second part of Paine's Age of Reason. The "Apology" was distributed free to the students of Harvard by the generosity of a number of Boston Gentlemen." Mass. Gazette, May 3, 1797. William Cobbett attacked Paine in a pamphlet entitled: *The Life of Paine*. It is much commended. Centinel, Jan. 21, 1797. The life takes up the greater portion of "The Political Censor.." Philadelphia, 1796. In Nathan Fiske's sermon preached at the Dudgeon Lecture in the chapel of Harvard College, (Sept. 7, 1796) there are given the "Antidotes to the poison" of the Age of Reason, pp. 14-16. In 1795, the Rev. Jeremy Belknap published *Dissertations on the Character, Death & Resurrection of Jesus Christ and the Evidence of His Gospel, with Remarks on some Sentiments Advanced in a Book Entitled "The Age of Reason."* [Boston. There are 148 pages divided into eight Dissertations.] The Rev. Myers Fisher published an answer to this writing of Paine's; as did Elias Boudinot. At the American Antiquarian Society's rooms there is a book called "Observations on the Age of Reason.." published in New York, 1795. The *Impartial Herald* (Sept. 19, 1797) has an account of Mr. Erskine's attack on the Age of Reason during the trial of Thomas Williams for selling that book in London. The Farmer's Weekly Museum (quoted in the Mass. Spy, Jan. 11, 1797) rescues the Book of Ruth, which has been denoted "an idle bundling story" by Paine, who is called a "renegade" of "deistical effrontery, and impious evil vulgarity." He is denounced as a "toad" by the Farmer's Weekly Museum, Jan. 17, 1797. See also *ibid.*, Jan. 24. The Centinel, (Dec. 23, 1797) asserts that "the leader of the mutineers on board the British ships at Plymouth was lead astray by Paine's Age of Reason." For the sad effect of the French Revolution and The Age of Reason upon Harvard College see Channing: *Memoir of W. E. Channing*, I:61-2. A notable defence of Paine and his book was undertaken by a pamphlet, *The Examiners Examined being a Defence of the Age of Reason*. N. Y., 1794. After supporting him—pp. 5 to 22—the writer attacks six antagonists of Paine, viz: Wakefield; Age of Infidelity; Guide to Reason (by S. Stillwell); The Folly of Reason; New York Reviewer, and the Rev. Uzal Ogdon's Address. The latter was of Trinity Church, Newark, N. J. The Address accompanied his proposals for printing *The Deist Unmasked, A Short Method with the Deist, &c.* The last is considered the "most violent" of the assaults upon Paine. Another attack was made upon this "notorious" book by a Layman. It was entitled *A Reply to the False Reasoning in the Age of Reason*. Phila., 1796. The Rev. William Patten [of the Second Congregational Church of Newport, R. I.] wrote: Christianity, the True Theology..in answer to "The Age of Reason;" with an Appendix, in Answer to "The Examiners Examined." Warren, R. I., 1795. There are 177 pages. See also *The Age of Credulity*. Phila., 1796. Paine's impudent letter to Washington damned him still deeper in contemporary opinion. The Centinel (Jan. 14, 1797) says: "a southern Printer intends..to publish a second edition of Paine's letter to our President, with the..title-page:—'By Thomas Paine, who ridiculed Jesus Christ, blackguarded the Bible, and villified George Washington.'" See also the Mass. Spy, Jan. 11, 1797; Western Star, Jan. 30, 1797; Salem Gazette, Jan. 24, 1797. The Massachusetts Spy, (Dec. 13, 1797, from the Gazette of the U. S.) quotes an extract—which is a most bitter attack—from a

work by P. Kennedy, Esq., entitled: *An Answer to Mr. Paine's Letter to General Washington, or Mad Tom convicted of the blackest Ingratitude.*"

APPENDIX J.

Influences of the Clergy in New England.

The New England clergy above all things were not afraid to mince matters. Even the Loyalist ministers did not hesitate to boldly bear witness to the political truth as they conceived it, unpleasant as the consequences would be. It is well known what a persecution the advocates of paper money in Rhode Island carried on against their opponents. Yet here is the Rev. Henry Channing writing: "The Paper money gentry considered me as greatly reprehensible because when in Newport I publicly prayed for & pitied them. I expect to visit Newport next week. I intend to go as far in boldness as will consist with the dignity of the Pulpit & the spirit of the Gospel, which is undaunted as well as meek." To D. Daggett, Lyme, Conn., Sept. 28, 1787. *Proc. Am. Antiq. Soc.*, N. S., IV (1885-7) 370.

Manfully did the clergy struggle to keep their congregations steady during the treasonable uprisings of Shays' Rebellion. B. Bidwell to D. Daggett, Tryingham, June 16, 1787. "The Gentlemen of learning & the liberal professions, especially the Clergy, are universally for Government." *Proc. Am. Antiq. Soc.*, N. S., IV (1885-7), 368. The Rev. Mr. Allen of Pittsfield was such a staunch advocate of government, that he incurred the ill will of the rebels to such an extent that he went constantly armed, his house being furnished with extra arms. Sprague: *Annals of the Am. Pulpit*, I:604. Isaac Beall was dismissed because of opinions hostile to Shays' Rebellion. Greenville Baptist Church, 150th Anniversary, p. 41. The Rev. Mr. Cushing of Ashburnham preached on Jan. 17th, 1787, from the text, "That there be no breaking in mor going out, that there be no complaining in our streets. Happy is that people that is in such a case." In this town there were no rebels, but 13 men went as soldiers to suppress the uprising. Stearns: *Hist. of Ashburnham*, p. 265. The Rev. Mr. Lathrop of West Springfield, though there were rebels in his town—notably the Days—preached powerful sermons in support of the government; e. g. on Dec. 14th, 1786, he preached most pertinently from the text: "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land: but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." This sermon was published [Springfield, 1787.] In his appendix to his Thanksgiving Day sermon of Feb. 19, 1795, the Rev. David Tappan says: "He remembers a public discourse of his [Rev. Mr. Ebenezer Bradford] in that trying period [Shays' Rebellion]..which form[s] a most striking contrast to the sermon before us." [Bradford's of Feb. 19, 1795], p. 40. Rev. Benjamin Conklin of Leicester was another of the clergymen who did valiant service in behalf of government in the insurgent ridden county of Worcester.

They took no less a decided stand in favor of the ratification of the Constitution. J. Hill to G. Thatcher, Jan. 1, 1788. After chronicling the large number of opposition delegates in Maine he says: "I have hopes the preaching of the Righteous will convert [convert] many from the errors of their way." *Hist. Mag.*, 2nd ser., VII (1869), 216. Indeed the Rev. Chandler Robbins rebukes the legislature and the state administration for their particularistic attitude in his Election Sermon, May 25, 1791. p. 46. The federalists prevailed upon the Rev. Samuel West to go to Hancock and induce him to offer the "Parsons" amendments in the convention. *Diary of J. Q. Adams*, p. 153, footnote. The Rev. Mr. Stillman was elected, purposely, to the convention to attach the Baptists to the federalist cause. Jackson to Knox, Boston, Nov. 11, 1787. Knox Mss., XXI:47; N. Gorham to Knox, Boston, Oct. 30, 1787. *Ibid.*, XXI:35. There were supposed to be twenty of the clergy in the Convention all favorable. Madison to Washington, New York, Feb. 3, 1788, (quoting a letter from a member of the convention) Sparks: *Correspondence of the Revolution*, IV:207.

Finally the fact must not be overlooked that in the absence of schools of higher learning, the clergy instructed practically all of those who became the leaders in every kind of profession and business. E. g. the Rev. Mr. Hallock in Plainfield, a small village, instructed upwards of 300 young men. Holland: *Hist. of Western Mass.*, II:265. The Rev. Dr. Cooley of Granville, another little community, estimated that he had taught probably as many as 800. *Ibid.*, I:513. Among a large number of examples which could be cited, see Mitchell: *Hist. of Bridgewater*, p. 47, and Hager: *Hist. of Boxborough*, p. 41. See also

Cutler, E. P., *Life and Times of Ephraim Cutler*, pp. 2-5. The Rev. David Tappan (in a sermon May 30, 1792, before the Convention of Congregational Ministers at Boston) asserts that "There is...in many respects, a natural alliance between the intelligent, virtuous Magistrates and Ministers, in a free and Christian state," [p. 20] while admitting that the theocracy in early New England "carried the union to an unwarrantable length," p. 25. See the Rev. Thomas Barnard's candid statement in his Convention Sermon, 1793, p. 11. The long pastorates which were so common on the whole in New England aided this influence greatly. One runs across quite often in the town histories of that section, such statements as the following: Rev. Mr. Bascom, who was pastor in Chester for 45 years, was "the most distinguished representative of the Federal side." Holland: *Hist. of Western Mass.*, II:35. Of the Rev. Mr. Cushing, who was pastor for nearly 61 years in Billerica, it is said: "The action of the town was often shaped by him." Hazen: *Hist. of Billerica*, p. 263. As a matter of fact in any crisis, the clergy were sure to be called upon in the newspapers for aid. See *Centinel*, May 30, 1787; *Ind. Ch.*, Feb. 8, 1798. To aid a prominent candidate a letter from "an eminent clergyman" is published as e. g. see the *Ind. Ch.*, May 26, 1796.

This paramount influence of the clergy lingered long in the state, especially in the western portion. For example the Rev. Dr. Perkins of Ware, who only closed his long pastorate of twenty-nine years in 1884, was a man of power in church and town affairs. There was no questioning of his will, especially in ecclesiastical matters, as many who are still living can testify.

APPENDIX K.

Democratic Attacks Upon the Clergy.

Ind. Ch., Feb. 27, 1797. The same old warning to the clergy is brought out again (*Ibid.*, Feb. 16, 1797) that "Should the British...by plunging us into a war with France, and thereby reduce us to Colonies...our reverend fathers would soon experience that Hierarchical domination...so long contended against by their venerable...predecessors." There are many severe accusations and innuendoes against the clergy this year (1797) in the *Independent Chronicle*. See e. g. April 13, 20, May 4, June 1, 15, July 24, Aug. 7, 21, Sept. 31, Oct. 5, 12, Nov. 6, 16, Dec. 14, 21, 25. Also "A Friend to the Clergy" appears several times in harangues, tedious in length and subjects, against the clergy for their political preaching and for their open devotion to "Wealth, Titles and Honors." He first fulminates in the May 1st issue of the *Independent Chronicle* in answer to "Anti-Calumniator" in the *Centinel*. On Oct. 16th (*ibid.*) he reproves the "Association of Ministers in and about Cambridge." "A Layman" replies on Oct. 30. *Ibid.* At the next opportunity this "Friend" comes back at the "Layman" whom he asserts is "one of the Associated Clergy." Finally on Nov. 20th [*Ibid.*] he concludes: "Once more permit me...to exhort you to repentance..." and the burden of his philippic is the same old tune—political preaching, dereliction of duty, scandalous affection for "Wealth, titles and honors." Another disgruntled individual remarks: "Sermons are not the taste of the day, unless they are written with a slanderous disposition to the French Republic, or to some of our public men, or measures." *Mass. Mercury*, Jan. 3, 1797. The most open attack was made by James Sullivan, (Amory: Sullivan, II:56-7) under the signature of "A Well-Wisher to the Clergy," upon Jeremy Belknap who in a sermon had reflected severely upon the *Chronicle*. Among other things he said: "The active part taken by some of the clergy in entering into the smallest minutia of political controversies, has had a tendency to do nearly as much hurt to religion, as the writings of Thomas Paine...the pulpit becomes, in too many instances, the little retail shop of party controversy, the sounding board of party reflections..." *Ind. Ch.*, April 13, May 1, 1797. See a reply in the *Centinel*, April 19, 1797, and the *Ind. Ch.*, May 11, from the *Phila. Daily Ad.* An interesting attack is made upon the clergy by "Freedom," who believes that "Paine, Ethen Allen or Universalism—infidels and sectaries as they are—are, many of them, better men than their opponents allow..." *Mass. Spy*, Jan. 10, 1798. He is roundly answered by "Hypocrite" and "The Neighbor" in *ibid.*, Jan. 31, 1798. "C. D." (*Ind. Ch.*, Dec. 28, 1797) replies to a "Subscriber" (*Mass. Mercury*, Dec. 22, 1797) who asks to have a piece inserted "to counteract *Chronicle* influence which, in humble imitation of Sister France is evidently hostile to the clergy." See also *Ind. Ch.*, Dec. 4, 1798, and The Medley or Newbedford *Marine Journal*, Nov. 23, 1798.

The French are so commonly charged with all the misfortunes which befall the United States (see e. g. Lathrop, J., Boston, March 16, 1797) that an extract from the (New London) Bee—in the Greenfield Gazette, Oct. 12th, 1797—complains: "There is not a calamity that can be inflicted by human means, which this country has suffered, but has been laid to the charge of the French. We are plundered at sea, robbed on land, inoculated with the yellow fever, and burnt in our houses—all by the French." The attacks on the French in the press continue as incessantly throughout 1797 as 1798 as before and after those years. They are denounced as the "Satan of France," the "Bible Burners" and the "Atheists." Other examples are in e. g. Mass. Spy, Aug. 23, 1797; Centinel, April 22, 29, Aug. 23, 1797; Western Star, April 2, 10, 1797, Jan. 15, 1798; Newburyport Herald, Feb. 6, March 23, Sept. 7, Dec. 4, 1798; Greenfield Gazette, Dec. 4, 1798. The republicans throughout are still marvelling that "the British faction have strangely infatuated such a large proportion of the Clergy." Ind. Ch., Oct. 5, 1797. The town of Marlborough (see the attacks upon it in the Mass. Spy, March 15, 1797) seems thoroughly embittered against the clergy. In February they give a toast: "The People—May they ever be on their guard, when Ministers preach politics. 9 cheers." Ibid, Feb. 23, 1797. On July 4th the 13th toast was "The Republican spirit which reigned in 1776—May the same now reign both in our civil and ecclesiastical orders." Ibid, July 17, 1797. In short as the Centinel—Dec. 26, 1798, truly remarked: "Nothing has more excruciatingly fretted the galled withers of the French Faction in our country, than the powerful shafts which have issued from those bulwarks of Piety and Patriotism, the New-England Pulpits..[Jacobinism] vent[s]..against..those..the most rancorous..malice, scurrilous abuse, and profanity..almost every page of..every Chronicle furnishes evidence.." of this.

APPENDIX L.

Alarm Over Religion in New England.

The charge that a secret society for the overthrow of religion was made by Dr. John Robinson of Edinburgh. He published a book containing evidence that a society of the Illuminati had been founded by Dr. Adams Weishaupt in 1776 and lodges located in Europe, and even in America. Its purpose was to destroy Christianity throughout the civilized world. The book made a great sensation; "sent to the press not fifteen months gone. It has received certainly four impressions and perhaps more," said Rev. Abiel Abbot in his sermons of the 29th of November, 1798, pp. 18-19, footnotes. The book reached America evidently in the summer of 1798, for the Thanksgiving sermons in November have many references to it. This information completed the panic the clergy were in concerning the "diabolical assaults" which were being made upon Christianity as well as their profession. The Rev. Joseph Lathrop preached a great sermon on The Dangers of the Times from Infidelity, and Immorality and especially from a lately Discovered Conspiracy against Religion and Government. This was delivered at West Springfield and repeated at Springfield. The leader in this exposé of Illuminatism is Rev. Jedediah Morse, who preached two strong sermons on the subject, which were widely quoted. See e. g. Mass. Mercury, Aug. 31, 1798, and an attack upon him. Ind. Ch., May 28, 1798, and his two replies, June 4, 18, in ibid. The appendix of his Thanksgiving sermon on November 29th, 1798, and the notes in the Fast sermon of April 2nd, 1798, contains elaborate references and quotations to substantiate his position. His charge that these lodges were planted in America failed from lack of proof, for he writes to J. Parker (a Congressman from Virginia) regarding a Lodge of Frenchmen in Portsmouth. The reply was that "The members..was considered as good people generally but mostly French, they were not numerous. Some men who were respectable belonged to the Lodge at that time.." Wolcott Mss., Conn. Hist. Soc. He wrote to Gov. Jay on June 5, 1799 regarding "secret societies." Ibid. Altogether the high sounding charges fell rather flat and the good doctor doubtless felt that he had been too precipitous. Besides he received a threatening letter (preserved still in the Wolcott Mss.) elaborately decorated with well executed coffins, death's heads and masonic emblems which caused him some perturbation.

The Masofs being so severely denounced replied. See e. g. Bently, William, An Address delivered in the Essex Lodge..December 27, 1798; Harris, T. M., A Discourse delivered in Brookfield, September 12, A. L. 5798; Wilde, S., An Oration delivered at Pownalborough [Me.]..June 24, 5799. Among the democrats a falsehood became synonymous with a "Robinson and Barruel tale." (That abbé having also attacked the Illuminati.) See Church and State; A Political Union formed

by the enemies of both. In the Centinel (Jan. 5, 1799.) is an attack upon these charges. To which a reply by "G. O." is made on Jan. 19, 1799. An elaborate attack is embodied in "Extracts from Professor Robinson's Proofs of a Conspiracy, &c., with Brief Reflections.. Boston, 1799. See also Wood, J., A Full Exposition of the Clintonian Faction and the Society of the Columbian Illuminati.. Newark, N. J., 1802. In the state campaigning of 1800 a federalist writes (Hampshire Gazette, April 2, 1800.) "It has been proven beyond all doubt, that there is a society of profligate and abandoned Philosophers called the Illuminati..did not these..exert every nerve..to prevent the choice of..Adams and to exalt..a modern Philosopher?..why is Mr. Gerry their..candidate? Because he has lately returned from France—from the bosom of..the illuminati—Because he is Talleyrand's friend—one of the first in this order of apostates." Nevertheless however mistaken the clergy might be over this organized attempt to overthrow religion—and they were loath to acknowledge their error for Jedidiah Morse is still writing for evidence in 1800—they had not the slightest doubt but that the influence of the French and their Revolution was most destructive of religion in this country. There is hardly a printed sermon of the years 1798 and 1799 which does not denounce "The French nation, a people, to whom Daemons might resent to be compared..[who have] extended their infernal designs to America..[They have] endeavoured to sow the seeds of irreligion, Hecentiousness and discord in..America.." Gray, R., Dover, [N. H.] Nov. 15, 1798, p. 17.

It is hardly necessary to quote more to prove the universal sentiments of the clergy in regard to the French and their atheism or "Satanic Host of Principles" [Harris, W., Boston, 1799, p. 13], the infidel books which "have been multiplied without bounds, and circulated without modesty," [Lathrop, J., West Springfield, 1798, p. 12] the French travellers who corrupt the people under the specious guise of exploring the country, [McFarland, A., Concord, Nov. 15, 1798, p. 13] or finally the dolorous results to religion and morality. See e. g. Taylor, J., Deerfield, Nov. 29, 1798, pp. 7, 10, and 11; Story, I., Marblehead, (and also at the Public Thursday lecture in Boston, May 24, 1798) May 9, 1798; Wilder, J., Wrentham, May 9, 1798, pp. 12, 26; Bradford, A., (Two sermons.) Wiscassit, [Me.] May 9, 1798, pp. 14 of the first, 2 and 19 of the second; Tappan, D., Boston, (and also at Charlestown) April 5, 1798, esp. pp. 8-9, 21-22; Messer, A., Rehoboth, Nov. 29, 1798, pp. 8, 11-12; Spring, S., Newburyport, Nov. 29, 1798. He exults (p. 19). "But..these French atheists..who have..committed greater abominations than the Mother of Harlots herself, are not permitted to trample upon the United States. For, the distinguished Envoys, who will be honoured according to their merit [a palpable hit at Elbridge Gerry]..stood gloriously in the gap and made up the national hedge." Cummings, H., Billerica, Nov. 29, 1798, p. 22; see also Tappan, D., A Discourse delivered..in..Harvard College, June 19, 1798 [Boston, 1798.]; Thatcher, T., A sermon preached..in Dedham, December 25, 1797 [Dedham, 1798] p. 28; Maxey, J., An Address delivered to the Graduates of Rhode-Island College.. September 5, A. D. 1798 [Providence, R. I. n. d.] esp. pp. 1-2.

The next year saw no diminution in either the output of the bitter denunciations of France and her misdeeds. On these points see e. g. Woods, L., (Two sermons) Newbury, April 4, 1799, p. 23; Frisbie, L., Ipswich, April 4, 1799, p. 46; Cummings, A., The present Time Perilous. Sullivan, [Me.] April 25, 1799, pp. 9, 22-3; Dana, J., (Two discourses) Ipswich, April 25, 1799, pp. 19-20, 29; Dana, D., (Two sermons) Newburyport, April 25, 1799, pp. 4-5, 37. Others who had their sermons printed on April 25th were: N. Emmons, Wrentham; E. Gillet, Hallowell, [Me.]; A. Holmes, Boston and Cambridge; J. Lathrop, West Springfield; H. Packard, Chelmsford (on April 4, and Concord; J. Morse, Charlestown. Those whose sermons on the Thanksgiving day of November 28th were printed were A. Abbot, Haverhill; P. Eaton, Boxford; J. Summer, Shrewsbury. On other occasions there were printed sermons in 1799 on the declensions of the times. E. g., T. Baldwin (at a quarterly meeting of several churches for special prayer in Boston. This is an outgrowth of the alarm over religion which was embodied in a circular letter drawn up by the clergy in Massachusetts and sent to the ministers in other states) April 2; T. Prentiss, Medfield, July 4; E. Parish, Byfield, who discourses on the "Hag of France," July 4; L. Woods, Harvard College, July 17; S. Miller, New York, Feb. 5; D. Dana, Newburyport, March 24; L. Woods, (Two sermons) April 4, 1799; See also Morse, J., An Address to the Students at Phillips Academy..July 4, 1799, pp. 12-13; Mellen, J., A Discourse on Natural Religion delivered in..Harvard University, September 4th, 1797, p. 24.

APPENDIX M.

Republican Attachment to France.

Curiously enough there were still those who were so infatuated with love of France that even at this time when war was all but declared, they openly announced their preference for that country. And such took as prominent an occasion as possible. For "after a sermon was elegantly delivered on fraternal love..all partook of the Lord's supper, unanimously, without any disputation on politics. The intermission was spent civilly without many hard words on either side..the afternoon solemnities commenced with much affability—but to the surprise of the beholders, a..Antifederalist..appeared sneakingly with a French Cockade, and placed himself in the front of the galleries—at the sight of which the Federalists..impatiently continued on their seats, until the conclusion of worship—when..before..[the pastor] was able to leave his pulpit, [As the congregation always stood while the minister descended from his pulpit and walked down the main aisle, this was a most unheard of breach of decorum] the Federalists, over benches, pews &c. ran..followed by clinching, swearing, and even blows—the screaming of old women heightened the scene—here were in view, justices, lawyers, and even grand juries, all clinching by collars, hair, and cheeks, until..the Jacobins were thrust out..some with no hats, others with bloody cheeks, and nearly all with disheveled poles." Centinel, Aug. 11, 1798. No services could be held for several Sabbaths. Ibid, Jan. 1, 1799. The Hampshire Gazette, Aug. 15, 1798, has quite an account of this exciting event and asserts there were more than one who wore there that "badge of slavery and treason." The Greenfield Gazette, Nov. 31, 1798, from the Conn. Advertiser, remarks that these disturbers of the Sabbath peace "were taken up and obliged to find bail each in a 1,000 dollars, for their appearance at the next court of sessions." See Hobart: Hist. of Abington, pp. 168-9, for a similar insult to the federalists. "There was, however, no collision."

In other ways those "who infamously exult in a foreign attachment" made known their predilections in a most offensive method, "Jacobin Poles" or Liberty and Equality Poles being erected with the French cockade perched upon them. The inevitable result was a struggle and "prostration in the dirt" of this "treasonable emblem." Centinel, March 14, Nov. 7, 1798; Pol. Repository, Dec. 11, 1798; Centinel, June 1, 1799. However this exhibition of French patriotism by Americans did not go without its reward for "a deluded principal..was apprehended..brought to [Boston]..for examination..[and] was recognized for his appearance at the next Circuit Court [of the United States], himself in 4,000 dollars, with three others in 1,300 dollars each, and in the mean time to [keep the].peace.." Pol. Repository, Nov. 13, 1798. The next year for the identical offence at the same place (Dedham) one Brown of Andover, was taken up and had to give bail for his appearance before the same court. Centinel, March 30, 1799. The Hampshire Gazette—Aug. 8, 1798—has a bitter attack on Gen. Skinner for his political activities especially in getting the editor of the Chronicle, "Adams—a flaming minister of anarchy"—to stir up trouble. "Their hellish malice has so far influenced and deluded the ignorant, that a rabble in the town of Adams..have procured a standard of rebellion [liberty pole]..and are this day about erecting it." The tirade closes with a promise of a coat of tar and feathers. Perhaps as a result the Berkshire Grand Jury denounced the Chronicle as publishing "more infamous falsehoods and slanders than" any other democratic paper. Ibid, Oct. 31, 1798.

If we may judge by the comments in the newspapers there had been a great many empty threats made by those who may with justice be termed American Jacobins. Thus the Centinel—Jan. 18, 1797, from the Minerva—remarks: "It is laughable to hear the 'patriots,' in our cities..talk about a civil war..a terrible bloody civil war, in case the French should make war on the United States. 'These citis will learn..that..there will be but one sentiment..in our country..'" Another time the Centinel—April 19, 1797—calls its readers' attention to the fact that "We were admonished last fall..to humble ourselves before God, for our rebellious disposition towards the French Republic" and on Aug. 11th, 1798, it again quotes the Chronicle, which, after repeating the necessity of humbling "ourselves..for our rebellion" against France makes the threat that "the first gun fired against France, would be fraught with utter ruin to this country." A month earlier, July 7th, 1798, the Centinel after remarking that "The War Office has established the black round cockade as the true American badge.." further says: "The Jacobins have the impudence to say, that

the people of Boston were really divided, and they give this as a proof, that not more than one half of them wears the AMERICAN COCKADE. This being the case, let every Bostonian attached to the United States, immediately mount THE COCKADE." Another bit of unpatriotic evidence which gave rise to much criticism was a toast given by the "Portland Republican Society," Dec. 30th, 1796, in reference to the failure at first to launch the "Constitution." The sentiment given was: "May the three American Frigates stand fast." Ind. Ch., Jan. 30, 1797. Another foolish action was the wearing of French colors by American soldiers in uniform. Centinel, April 24, 1799. So persistently did the French sympathizers mount the French cockade that they were called "Cockadees." Ibid, March 17, 1798. And war had practically broken out!

APPENDIX N.

"Dangers" to Congregationalism.

Unitarianism was not the only foe the Congregational divines had to face. Universalism was considered very obnoxious because by releasing men from the fear of eternal punishment hereafter it loosened—so it seemed to the orthodox—all restraint from the actions of the "finally impenitent and incorrigible." See the Mass. Spy, Nov. 15, 1797, Jan. 10, 1798. In an ordination sermon preached by the Rev. Cyprian Strong at Lenox (April 30th, 1795), while he finds "infidelity and deism prevalent to an alarming degree" he discovers that there are "other errors of various kinds, not less baleful..creeping in and gaining ground among us." p. 25. The Rev. N. Emmons, of Franklin, preached an ordination sermon at Salem, N. H., on January 4th, 1797. On p. 19 he says: "IT is now a very dangerous day to Ministers..The people have fallen into a great and general declension..Arminianism [i. e. Unitarianism], universalism, and deism, have more or less infected all our towns and parishes; and led multitudes to renounce..religion." A pamphlet entitled Observations on the Emigration of Dr. Joseph Priestly [3rd ed., Phila., 1795.] attacks the "infidel Unitarian system." See esp. pp. 42, 47, 78. [See Priestly's defense entitled: Unitarianism explained and defended, in a Discourse delivered..at Philadelphia, 1796. Phila., 1796.] An answer was made to this which in turn was attacked by A Twig of Birch for a butting Calf; or Strictures upon Remarks on the Emigration of Doctor Joseph Priestly, &c., &c. N. Y., 1795. Both these attacks on Dr. Priestly are supposed to be by William Cobbet. Timothy Dwight's famous poem The Triumph of Infidelity (1788) is little more than an attack on Unitarianism.

The growth of other sects, Methodists and Baptists, was not looked upon with a friendly eye by the "established" divines especially in Maine, where the rapid growth of new settlements offered the former great opportunities. See for their rapid growth Salem Gazette, Nov. 25, 1796. It is asserted that the poverty of the people after the Revolution led them "to favor apostolic poverty and to regard the..congregational divines" as mere "hirelings" who "carried the appearance of caring more for the fleece than the flock." Besides, the "habit of preaching without notes which the Baptists elders had, rendered them exceedingly popular especially in the out-lying districts." Coll. Me. Hist. Soc., VII (1876) 224. For the troubles of a Congregational clergyman with these sects, see Coll. Me. Hist. Soc. IV (1856).

The "orthodox" divines resented the intrusion of these men whom they did not consider in many instances as being actual clergymen. See Gray, R., Hallowell, [Me.] Oct. 21, 1795, p. 33. The Rev. Thomas Thatcher was very severe, demanding "what credentials do they exhibit except impudence and low breeding..what miracles do they [the unlearned itinerent preachers who "infest" Maine] work unless the number of fools and maniacs they collect to hear them vociferating their blasphemy and impertinence...it is difficult to determine whether knave or fool is the predominant trait in their character." "In one solitary instance..our blessed Lord had need of an Ass, but I do not find.. that he ever commissioned that sagacious animal to be an Apostle." p. 14. Ordination Sermon at Peterborough, N. H., Oct. 23, 1799. A brimstone tract was the sermon by Rev. William Huntington entitled: Advocates for Devils Refuted, and their Hope of the Damned Demolished.. Keene, N. H., 1796. See also J. Wilson: Apostolic Church Government Displayed and the Government and System of the Methodist Episcopal Church Investigated. Providence, 1798. Likewise Silas Winch: The Age of Superstition containing remarks on Methodist Preachers. Boston, 1795, esp. pp. 3-4.

APPENDIX O.

"Weapons" Against Ecclesiastical Authority.

This person was Levi Lincoln of Worcester. On Nov. 29th, 1799, Jedidiah Morse wrote to O. Wolcott enclosing apparently a pamphlet on which he comments that it "is evidently the production of the crazy & wicked J. C. Ogdon assisted probably by some abler hand, & adapted..to do a good deal of mischief. It is one among many weapons using at this time to destroy the influence of the Clergy." Wolcott Mss., Conn. Hist. Soc. One of these "weapons" was *A View of the New-England Illuminati: Who are indefatigably engaged in Destroying the Religion and Government of the United States; under a feigned regard for their Safety and under an impious Abuse of True Religion.* A second edition was published in Philadelphia. While all the New England clergy were included in its indictment, its heavy charges were especially directed toward the Connecticut clergy. These "Illuminated Societies have handed about nominations for magistrates, and denounced good men at elections..The quick and extensive circulation of the plans—from one club to another—their control over the freedom of the press, and attempts to stop the channels of communication.. are among the smaller offences..In this way Connecticut especially has become almost totally an ecclesiastical state, ruled by the President of the College as a Monarch..[This was "Pope (Timothy) Dwight.""] To extend the influence..and power' of these..missions have been formed and missionaries sent into all the frontier parts of the states." pp. 8-9. "Concerts of prayer to be held quarterly" was also mentioned as another evidence of this "conspiracy." For these "concerts" see a pamphlet entitled *Circular Letters, containing an Invitation to the Ministers and Churches of every Christian Denomination in the United States to unite..to promote Explicit Agreement and Visible Union..in extraordinary Prayer, for the Revival of Religion..* [Concord, 1798.] On page 6 it is proposed to pray "on every first Tuesday of the four quarters of the year, at 2 o'clock afternoon..and so continuing..from year to year, until ..we shall obtain the blessings for which we pray.." Other "weapons" were Bishop, A., *Proofs of a Conspiracy against Christianity and the Government of the United States; exhibited in several Views of the Union of Church and State in New-England.* Hartford, 1802. In his *Oration on the Extent of Political Delusion.* September, 1800. [Phila., 1800.] he comments on the fear of the clergy that the church is in danger [pp. 42-4]; he denounces [pp. 44-5] "the pantomimical sermons, which have[ing] graced political Sabbaths are laughed at;" the accusations about Jefferson's atheism are despised; "the monstrous noise about..infidelity is abated..The terrible outcry about French atheism met a similar fate." He also put forth: *Church and State, A Political Union formed by the Enemies of Both,* n. p., 1802. In the preface he says: "Great exertions have been made in New-England, to impress the people with a persuasion, that Republicans are opposed to Christianity." His *Oration delivered in Wallingford [Conn.]..11th of March, 1801, before the Republicans of..Connecticut, at Their General Thanksgiving for the Election of Thomas Jefferson..* [New Haven, 1801.] is of the same tenor. A bitter attack along similar lines was: *A Short History of late Ecclesiastical Oppressions in New-England and Vermont.* Richmond, Va., 1799.

INDEX.

A

- Adams, John, opposed by the Essex Junto, 16, 177; aided by the same, 18-19; opinion of, regarding distinctons, 69; proclamaton of, 173.
- Adams, Samuel, jealous of Hancock, 15; successor of Hancock, 19, 66, 140; defeated in Boston, 19-20; elected lieut.-gov., 20; advisor of Hancock, 22; opposes the Fed. Constitution, 43; anti-federal motion of, 48-49; candidate for lieut.-gov., 58; elected lieut.-gov., 62; protest of Dannery to, 73; attack on Adams, 73-74; proclamation of, 113; letter to, 120; Thanksgiving proclamation of, 126-127; eulogy of, 132-133; candidate for gov., 141-142; strictures upon, 142; election of, 143; attitude towards mobs, 154; replies of the General Court to, 158; campaign against, 159-161; election of, 161; retires from politics, 174.
- Addressors of Gage, 11.
- Age of Reason, The, see Paine, T.
- Allen, E., 107.
- Allen, Sheriff, 155.
- American Revolution, irreligious tendencies from, 100, 107.
- American Volunteers, proposals to raise the, 70.
- Ames, Fisher, elected to Congress, 148; commends Osgood's sermon, 150; denounces the democrats, 155; letter of, 156.
- Amherst College, founding of, 185.
- Antifederalists, leaders of the, 23; relationship to Shayism, 44; tactics in the Mass. Convention, 49; arguments against the Constitution, 49; control the House, 59-60.
- Atheism, see Irreligion.
- Austin, B., assaulted by B. Russel, 76; influence in Shays' Rebellion, 147; opponent of S. Higginson, 147; opposition of, to J. Sullivan, 174.

B.

- Bacon, J., qualifications of, 116-117; 176 note.
- Bache, falsifications of, 145.
- Belknap, J., 166-168.
- Berkshire County, sympathy of, with Shays, 144-145.
- Betsy, The, of St. Croix, destruction of, 153.
- Blodgett, S., 120.
- Boston, evacuation of, 12; importance of, 16; defeats S. Adams, 20; meetings at, 30; campaign over representation in, 30-31; approves of the Constitution, 54; danger of the Constitution to, 46; meeting of the mechanics of, 51; civic feasts at, 67, Appendix G; arrival of La Concorde at, 72; prizes brought in to, 72-73; question of a theatre in, 103; heated meetings in, 145-146; factions in, 147-148; uproars in, 151-152; riots in, 153-155; robberies of merchants of, 155.
- Boston caucus, power of the, 174-175.
- Boston Seat, The, S. Adams defeated for, 19-20; campaign of 1785 for, 30-31.
- Bowdoin, James, opponent of Hancock, 19; leader of the conservatives, 22; moral courage of, 22-23; friends of 23; leader of the federalists, 24; defeat of, in 1780, 24; declines the lieut.-governorship, 25; ill health of, 25; campaign of, in 1785, 28; popular vote for governor, 29-31; elected by the legislature, 31; address regarding foreign trade, 31-32; popular opposition to, 54; dangers in his defeat, 55; handbill concerning, 56; defeat of, 56-57; candidate in 1789, 61; proclamation of, 103.
- Bowdoinites, angered by defeat of leader, 57; denounced by the Hancocknians, 57-58.
- Bradford, E., sermon of, 131-133; dispute with Dr. Tappen, 133; attacks upon, 133-134.
- Brissot, 79.
- Bristol County, attitude towards the Constitution, 47.
- British Factors, denunciations of, 28-30; attacks upon, 33.
- Brittainy, 80-81.

C.

- Charlestown, 151-152.
 Cincinnati, Order of the, change in sentiment toward the, 60.
 "Citizen Genet pirate," 74.
 Citizen Novian, see **Sullivan, James**.
 Civic Feasts, popularity of the, 67, 70, Appendix G.
 Clergy, The, power of, 12; enthusiasm for France among, 88-94; change in attitude of, 94; federalistic sentiments of, 94-95; attacks of, upon the Democratic Societies, 96-98; alarm among, over irreligion in France, 98-100; in America, 100-107; answers by, to the Age of Reason, 108-110; preaching of, against France, 110-112; early power of, 121-122; loss of power of, 122-124; anti-democratic attacks of, 126-131; democratic assaults upon, 134-136, 137-138, 165-166, Appendix K; replies by, 136-137; consequences to, 138-139; denounce the French, 169-173; formal address of, 172-173; temporary loss of power by, in western Mass., 182-183; bitter attacks upon, 185-187; influences of, Appendix J; "weapons" against, Appendix O.
 Cobbett, W., 168.
 Committee of Correspondence, 13-14.
 Common Pleas, Court of, 36.
 Congregationalism, strength of, in western Mass., 185; "dangers to," Appendix N.
 Congress, jealousies of the Mass. delegates in, 15; and the merchants, 26; speech of Bowdoin's concerning, 31-32; weakness of, 33, 40-41.
 Connecticut, emigration from, 6.
 Constitution, Federal, forces for and against, 40-43; letter of Knox regarding, 45; publication, 45; attacks upon, 46; objections to, 49; question of amendments of, 50; conversion of leaders in favor of, 51-52; vote upon, 52.
 Constitutional Club, The, founding of, 74-75; connection of S. Adams with, 142; pol. activity of, 145; act of piracy of, 147-148; decline of, 159.
 Convention, Constitutional, political of, 1787-8, in Mass., see Constitution, Federal.
 Convention, proposed by Bowdoin, 31-33; see also Hatfield.
 Convention, The French, rebukes for, 78; irreligious attitude of, 80-83.
 Cordeliers, Club of the, 81.
 Cumings, H., 168-169.
 Cushing, T., acting gov., 28; candidate for gov., 28; denounced as a tool of Hancock, 29.
 Cushing, Judge, character of, 119-120; nominated for gov., 141; handicap of, 142-144; opinion of, regarding the canvass, 143.

D.

- Dana, F., 48.
 Dannery, 73.
 Danton, 80.
 Democracy, excess of, 41.
 Democrat, A, estimate of, 117-118.
 Democratic Societies, The, uproar over, 75-76; purpose of, 95-96; accusations against, 95-98; opinion of Dr. Osgood of, 127; praise for the, 132; death of the first of, 158.
 Democrats, The, sermons against, 166-173; attacks of, upon the clergy, 126, 128-131, 134-138, 165-166.
 Dexter, S., excitement over the speech of, 145-146; election of, to Congress, 148.
 Directory, The French, 169.
 Donnison, W., 153.
 Dracut, 152.
 Duplane, 73.
 Dwight, Timothy, 171.

E.

- Election of 1785, importance of the, 26-27.
 Election of 1787, account of the, Appendix C.
 Eliot, J., 93.
 Émigrés, 77.
 Emmons, N., 104-105.
 Equality, idea of, 68-70.
 Essex County, importance of, 16; religious conditions in, 102-103.
 Essex Junto, The, description of, 16-17; power of, 16; successful efforts of, 17-18; aided J. Adams, 18-19; lead by Bowdoin, 22; quarrel of, with J. Adams, 177.
 Essex Result, The, 18.

F.

Fast Day, National, proclamation upon the, 173.

Fast Day, State, sermon on the, 133.

Federal Oratory, 154.

Federalist Party in Massachusetts, The, beginning of, 8; outline of after 1800, 9-10; birth of, 17-18; early leader of, 19, 22; early growth of, 26; support Hancock, 58; defeat of, 62; control the state Senate, 64-65; renewed hopes of, 141; defeat of, 143-145; make no contest in 1795, 149; aided by the clergy, 149; attempt to elect Sumner, 159-160; captures the legislature, 163-164; triumph of, 175; reaction against, 176-177; victorious again, 177-180; strength of, in western Mass., 180; causes of this strength, 180-185; bargain of, with Hancock, Appendix E.

Fee Table, 36.

Five per cent. Impost, 26, 33.

Forestalling, 14.

France, reports of bloodshed in, 77; outrages in, 78; criticisms of, 78-79; changed attitude toward, 79-80; irreligion in, 80-87; frightful conditions in, 87; enthusiasm for, by the clergy, 88-89; denunciations of the enemies of, 89-91; dismay over the horrors in, 91-92; complacency toward irreligion in, 92-93; anti-catholic spirit in, 93-94; change in sentiment toward, 94; introduction of the Democratic Societies from, 97; dismay over the irreligion in, 98-100; evil influence of, upon America, 101-102; preaching against, 110-112; attacks upon, in the newspapers, 112-113; victories in, 128; defence of, 129; sermons against, 170-172; proclamations against, 172-173.

French Revolution, The, enthusiasm over, 67-68; watchwords of, 68-70; early excesses of, 70; opponents of, 72; progress of, 78; opposition to, 79-83; irreligion of, 83-87; as viewed by the clergy, 88-116.

Frisbie, L., 105-106.

G.

Gage, Gen., 11.

Gardiner, J. S. J., revelling of, 127-128; author of the Jacobiniad, 151.

General Sessions of the Peace, Court of, 36.

Genet, 71-72.

Gerry, Elbridge, jealous of Hancock, 19; opposes Hancock, 19; exponent of republicanism, 23; leader of the antifederalists, 24; answers Bowdoin's address, 32-33; opposes the Constitution, 43; in the Mass. Convention, 48-49; nominated for gov., 178; qualifications of, 179.

Gill, J., nominated for gov., 174; defeated, 175; acting gov., 178.

Girondists, 79.

Gorham, N., 141.

Greyhound, The, 72-73.

H.

Half-pay, answer of the people at, 34.

Hancock, John, controls Whig Party, 14; jealous opponents of, 15; elected gov., 19, 24-25, 26; influence of, 19-21; reputation for patriotism, 21; popularity, 21, 65; want of principles, 21-22; lack of abilities, 22; alleged corrupt motives, 23; check to popularity of, 27; pol. foresight of, 70; resignation of, 27; pol. attacks upon, 29; nominated for the Boston Seat, 30; causes for opposition of, to the Constitution, 42; relation to the amendments, 50-52; nominated for gov., 54; accusations against, 56; decisive victory of, 56-57; elected in 1788, 58; attacked by Higginson, 61; opposes Lincoln, 62, 64, Appendix F; elected gov., 62-63; failure of, in national politics, 64; agrees with S. Adams, 65-66; seizes the prizes of the Roland, 73; proclamation of, 88; anti-national views of, 126; death of, 140; eulogy of, 140-141; friendship of, with S. Adams, 160-161; bargain of, with the federalists, Appendix E.

Harvard College, 121; 184-185.

Hatfield Convention, 35-36.

Heath, W., 176.

Henderson, Capt., 74.

Higginson, Stephen, strictures of, upon Hancock, 61; advocate of federalism, 147; letter of, 152.

Holton, S., 32-33.

Howe, Gen., 12.

Hutchinson, Gov., 22.

Hyde, A., 168-169.

I.

Illuminati, 171, Appendix L.
 Immigration, from England, 5-6; dangers from, 112.
 Ipswich, 17.
 Irreligion, in France, 80-87; in America, 82, 100-107, 112-115.

J.

Jacobin Clubs, see the Democratic Societies..
 Jacobiniad, The, 151.
 Jay's Treaty, excitements over, 136, 137-138, 151, 152, 155-156; attacks of S. Adams upon, 157-158; replies of the legislature concerning, 158; Mass. towns in favor of, 163.
 Jefferson, Thomas, defeat of, 16; politics of, 117; beliefs of, 121; letters of, 176, 190.

K.

Kennebec Squatters, 43-44.
 King, Rufus, 32-33; letters of, 50, 51, 60.
 Knox, Henry, 45.

L.

La Concorde, 7, 73, 147-148.
 Lafayette, 78.
 Lathrop, J., 112.
 Levelling, 36-37, 69.
 Lexington, 12.
 Lincoln, Benjamin, candidate for lieut.-gov., 58; elected by the Gen. Court, 59; defeated for lieut.-gov., 62; opposition to, by Hancock, 62, 64, Appendix F; letter of, 125.
 Lincoln, Levi, diatribes of, against the clergy, 185-187.
 Louis XVI, effect of the death of, in America, 67, 77-78.
 Loyalist Party, The, causes of the downfall of, 11-12; numbers of, 12-13; importance of, 13.
 "Lyars, The," 151.
 Lyman, J., 90.
 Lyman, W. S., 164.

M.

McKeen, J., 91.
 Maine, settlement of, 7; attitude of, towards the Constitution, 48.
 Mandamus Counsellors, 11.
 Marat, 80.
 Marie Antoinette, sympathy for, 79.
 Massachusetts, emigration from, 6; problem of, 8; conditions in, 9; Loyalists in, 11; weakness of government in, 13; lack of patriotism in, 14-15; three parties in, 15; dominated by Boston, 16; leaders of, 16; pol. parties of, in 1780, 19-24; economic disorders in, 26-27, 33-39; agitations over British Factors, 28-30, 33; good order in, 38-39; taxation of British vessels by, 40; importance of, 40, 42; adoption of the Constitution in, 40-54; power of Hancock in, 64; reply of the towns of, to the President, 71; admiration for Washington in, 95; limitation of the Sabbath in, 103; popularity of Hancock in, 140; importance of the clergy of, 125, 165.
 Massachusetts Constitution of 1778, framed by the legislature, 17; weaknesses of, 18.
 Massachusetts Constitution of 1780, convention for framing the, 18; conservative character of the, 18-19.
 Mendon Association, 114-115.
 Middlesex County, 175.
 "Mohawk Indians," 28.
 Morse, J., 92, 127, 148, 150, 151-152, 156.

N.

Neutrality, Proclamation of, answer of the Mass. towns to the, 71.
 New England, immigration to, 5; emigration from, 6; geographical position of, 7; rivalry of, with the South, 7, 8 note, 17; incipient rebellions in, 8, 9, 16; contrast of, with the Middle States, 117.
 New England Nation, idea of the, 8.

O.

Oracles of Reason, The, 107.
Osgood, D., 126-127, 127-130, 130-131, 156, 170.

P.

Paine, Thomas, attacks upon his Age of Reason, 108-110, 117, Appendix I; influence of, 150.
Paris, mob at, 70; festivals at, 85.
Parsons, Theophilus, member of the Essex Junto, 17; influence in the Essex Result, 17-18; influence of, in the Constitutional Convention, 51.
Party Revolution of 1800, 9.
Patriotic Party, The, growth of, 11 note; triumph of, 11-12; struggle for control of, 14; demoralization of, 14.
Patriotic Volunteers, 70.
Philadelphia, 117.
Poland, 91.

R.

Religion, alarm over, Appendix L.
Remonstrators to the Solemn League and Covenant, 11.
Rhode Island, 6.
Robespierre, 80, 84-85.
Roland, The, 72-73.
Rush, Judge, 114.
Russel, B., 76.

S.

Sedgwick, Theodore, 148-149, 164.
Sermons, see Bibliography; Appendix H.
Shays' Rebellion, influence of, 33; results of, 38, 40-41, 50; aims of, 44; effect on the clergy, 124; S. Adams's attitude towards, 144; strength of, in Berkshire County, 144-145; effect of upon western Mass., 183-184; troubles before, Appendix A; Appendix B; Appendix D.
Shepard, S., 106-107.
Singletary, A., 49-50.
Spring, S., 90.
Strong, Caleb, qualifications of, 119; nominated for gov., 178; elected, 179.
Strong, C., 106-107.
Strong, J., 106.
Sullivan, James, advisor of Hancock, 22; replies to Osgood as Citizen Novian, 129; attempts to quell rioters, 155; nominated for gov., 174; defeated, 175.
Sumner, Increase, nominated for gov., 160; defeat of, 161-162; again nominated, 174; elected in 1797 and 1798, 175; runs in 1799, 176; death of, 177-178.
Sunday, abolishment of, in France, 81-82; limitation of, in Mass., 103; violations of, 104; disregard of, 115 note; strict observance of, 118-119; increase in violators of, 172.
Supreme Being, Festivals of the, at Paris, 85.

T.

Tappen, D., 105, 133.
Temple, J., 28.
Tender Act of 1782, 34.
Thanksgiving Day, National, 130-133, 150.
Thanksgiving Day, State, 126-127, 156.
Thatcher, T. C., 105, 122-123.

U.

Unitarianism, 184.

V.

Vermont, settlement of, 6-7; emigration to, 183.
Virginia Resolutions, 157.

W.

War of 1812, 9.

Ware, H., 93.
 Warren, James, opposes Hancock, 19; exponent of republicanism, 23; refuses lieutenant-governorship, 24; antifederal candidate for gov., 58.
 Washington County, 175.
 Washington, George, defense of, 47; admiration for, in Mass., 95; attacks the Democratic Societies, 96; ingratitude to, 169.
 "Watermelon Mob" or "Frolic", The, 154-155.
 West, S., 93.
 Western Massachusetts, predominatingly federalistic, 8; early hostility to law in, 38 note; opposed to the Constitution, 48; federalistic strength in, 180; early history of, 181; effect of the Revolution upon, 181-183; effect of Shays' Rebellion upon, 183-184; religious conservatism of, 185.
 Whigs, The, see Patriotic Party, The.
 Whiskey Rebellion, The, attacks upon, 95-96; cost of, 97; relation with the Democratic Societies, 127.
 Wolcott, O., 120.
 Worcester County, 48.

X.

X. Y. Z. Letters, 169-176.

Y.

Yale College, 185.
 York County, 175.

